arXiv:1508.05706v2 [hep-th] 7 Sep 2015

Preprint TU-992, UTHEP-677

Gravity theory on Poisson manifold with R-flux

T. Asakawa[♯1], H. Muraki[♭2] and S. Watamura[†3]

♯ Department of Integrated Design Engineering,
Faculty of Engineering,
Maebashi Institute of Technology
Maebashi, 371-0816, Japan

♭ Graduate School of Pure and Applied Sciences,
University of Tsukuba
Tsukuba, 305-8571, Japan

† Particle Theory and Cosmology Group,
Department of Physics,
Graduate School of Science,
Tohoku University
Aoba-ku, Sendai, 980-8578, Japan

Abstract

A novel gravity theory based on Poisson Generalized Geometry is investigated. A gravity theory on a Poisson manifold equipped with a Riemannian metric is constructed from a contravariant version of the Levi-Civita connection, which is based on the Lie algebroid of a Poisson manifold. Then, we show that in Poisson Generalized Geometry the R-fluxes are consistently coupled with such a gravity. An R-flux appears as a torsion of the corresponding connection in a similar way as an H-flux which appears as a torsion of the connection formulated in the standard Generalized Geometry. We give an analogue of the Einstein-Hilbert action coupled with an R-flux, and show that it is invariant under both β-diffeomorphisms and β-gauge transformations.

---

[1] e-mail: asakawa@maebashi-it.ac.jp
[2] e-mail: hmuraki@het.ph.tsukuba.ac.jp
[3] e-mail: watamura@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Riemannian geometry on Poisson manifold **2**
2.1 Lie algebroid on a Poisson manifold . . . 3
2.2 Contravariant Levi-Civita connection . . . 4
2.3 Tensor calculus . . . 7
2.4 Ordinary Levi-Civita connection as contravariant affine connection . . . 10

3 Gravity theory based on Poisson Generalized Geometry **12**
3.1 Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ . . . 12
3.2 Generalized Riemannian structure . . . 14
3.3 Contravariant connection, torsion and curvature . . . 15
3.4 Local expressions . . . 16
3.5 Invariant measure . . . 19
3.6 Einstein-Hilbert-like action and others . . . 21

4 Conclusion and Discussion **22**

A Riemannian geometry based on Generalized Geometry **26**
A.1 Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$ . . . 26
A.2 Generalized Riemannian geometry . . . 26

B Computational details **28**

1 Introduction

Poisson Generalized Geometry (PGG) [1,2] is a variant of Generalized Geometry (GG) [3–5] in the sense that it shares the same bundle $TM \oplus T^*M$, where TM and T^*M are tangent and cotangent bundles of a manifold M, while the roles of vectors and 1-forms are exchanged in PGG. The bracket used in PGG defines a type of Courant algebroid, which has its basis on a Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ of a Poisson manifold M [6–8].

The symmetry of the Courant algebroid of PGG consists of β-diffeomorphisms and β-transformations, following the terminology introduced in [9,10][4]. An R-flux, i.e. a totally anti-symmetric tensor of type $(3,0)$, naturally arises in this framework as an Abelian field strength associated with a twisting by local β-transformations [1]. However, it is not yet clear that this flux can actually be interpreted as the "R-flux" which is one of the non-geometric fluxes argued in physics literature [11–13]. In order to clarify this point, we investigate in this paper a construction of gravity theory coupled with the R-flux of PGG, since the non-geometric fluxes are considered mainly in the context of gravity theory coupled with them.

---

[4] Strictly speaking, the β-diffeomorphism defined by the authors [9,10] is different from our definition. See [1].

In the framework of GG, the underlying Riemannian geometry for a gravity theory coupled with an H-flux is investigated [14–16]. It turns out that the resulting gravity is merely a lift of the usual general relativity, i.e. it is based on the Levi-Civita connection on the tangent bundle TM, and the H-flux is incorporated as a torsion part added to this connection under the lift. Eventually, it turns out that it is the same as the NS-NS sector of supergravity theory, whose action is invariant under the symmetry of GG, that is, diffeomorphisms and B-(field) gauge transformations.

In analogy with GG, it is natural to expect that a gravity theory in PGG has similar structures to that in GG. Namely, it has been suggested that the gravity theory would be a theory invariant under β-diffeomorphisms and β-gauge transformations. To show this, it is first required to formulate a "general relativity," which is invariant under β-diffeomorphisms on a Poisson manifold, because no well-accepted theory of gravity of such kind has been known at least in the physics literature. Following mathematical literature [17–22], we construct such a gravity based on the Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ of a Poisson manifold, by replacing the Levi-Civita connection with its contravariant analogue. We then extend this construction to that in PGG coupled to an R-flux by applying the same strategy as used in GG [14–16]. We show that an R-flux appears as a torsion part added to the contravariant analogue of the Levi-Civita connection under the lift, in a similar manner as it is done in the case of an H-flux. By introducing an appropriate integration measure, we obtain an Einstein-Hilbert-like action for this gravity theory invariant under both β-diffeomorphisms and β-gauge transformations. In this paper, we assume that the spacetime metric has Euclidean signature, though the extension to Lorentzian signature is straightforward.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we study a Riemannian geometry that is compatible with a Poisson structure. In section 3, a construction of gravity theory based on Poisson generalized geometry in the presence of an R-flux is investigated. In section 4, we summarize this paper. Comparisons with other approaches are also discussed. Since our constructions are analogous to those of [14, 15], we give a short review on them in appendix A. Appendix B is devoted to the computational details.

2 Riemannian geometry on Poisson manifold

The standard general relativity is based on Riemannian geometry, more precisely, it is based explicitly on a Riemannian metric on the tangent bundle TM of a manifold M, and thus implicitly also on structures of the TM as a Lie algebroid. Then, if the underlying Lie algebroid TM is replaced by a different Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ as introduced below, the subsequent geometrical objects, such as connection, torsion, curvature etc., are also replaced.

More generally, in order to formulate a gravity theory associated with a Lie algebroid A, we need the following materials:

1. a Lie algebroid A as an infinitesimal symmetry,
2. a differential algebra $(\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet A^*), \wedge, d_A)$ as a differential calculus,

3. a Riemannian metric on A,
4. an affine A-connection $\nabla : \Gamma(A) \to \Gamma(A^* \otimes A)$ on the vector bundle A,
5. a torsion and a Riemann curvature tensor of the affine connection ∇,
6. a notion of A-tensor fields, together with their transformation properties under A,
7. an invariant measure with respect to the symmetry A,
8. an Einstein-Hilbert like action.

The first two objects in the list, 1 and 2, are well-known (see for example [23]), and the objects in 3-5 have already been studied in mathematical literature [17–22].

In this section, we review the formalism for the case of $A = (T^*M)_\theta$, emphasizing a physicist's viewpoint and give a study of A-tensor fields listed in point 6. The remaining two points, 7 and 8, will be studied in the next section.

2.1 Lie algebroid on a Poisson manifold

Let M be an n-dimensional Poisson manifold equipped with a Poisson bivector $\theta \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$. Here, θ satisfies the Poisson condition $[\theta, \theta]_S = 0$, where $[\cdot, \cdot]_S$ is the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket. A Lie algebroid of a Poisson manifold [23] is defined by a triple $(T^*M,\, \theta,\, [\cdot, \cdot]_\theta)$, where T^*M is the cotangent bundle over M, the anchor map $\theta : T^*M \to TM$ is defined by the Poisson bivector as $\theta(\xi) = \bar{\iota}_\xi \theta$, for $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, and the Lie bracket is defined by the Koszul bracket

$$[\xi, \eta]_\theta = \mathcal{L}_{\theta(\xi)} \eta - i_{\theta(\eta)} d\xi. \tag{2.1}$$

We denote this Lie algebroid $(T^*M,\, \theta,\, [\cdot, \cdot]_\theta)$ as $(T^*M)_\theta$ for short.

We can define an exterior derivative as $d_\theta = [\theta, \cdot]_S$ on the space of polyvectors $\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet TM)$, which is nilpotent $d_\theta^2 = 0$ due to the Poisson condition. For a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, its action yields the Hamiltonian vector field:

$$d_\theta f = [\theta, f]_S = -\theta(df). \tag{2.2}$$

The actions of the "Lie derivative" $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ with $\zeta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$ on a function f, a 1-form ξ and a vector field X are given by[5]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta f &:= \bar{\iota}_\zeta d_\theta f, \\ \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \xi &:= [\zeta, \xi]_\theta, \\ \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta X &:= (d_\theta \bar{\iota}_\zeta + \bar{\iota}_\zeta d_\theta) X, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

respectively. These operations satisfy the following Cartan relations on the space of polyvectors $\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet TM)$

$$\{\bar{\iota}_\xi, \bar{\iota}_\eta\} = 0, \quad \{d_\theta, \bar{\iota}_\xi\} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi, \quad [\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi, \bar{\iota}_\eta] = \bar{\iota}_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta}, \quad [\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta] = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta}, \quad [d_\theta, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi] = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

With the use of these operations, a differential geometry based on the Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ (instead of TM) can be considered on a Poisson manifold.

---

[5] We use the symbol $\bar{}$ to distinguish the operations of differential calculus induced by 1-forms from the usual ones induced by vector fields. For example, $\bar{\iota}_\xi$ denotes the "interior product" of a 1-form ξ.

2.2 Contravariant Levi-Civita connection

In this section we study Riemannian geometry compatible with a Poisson structure, following [17–21].

Let M be a Riemannian manifold as well as a Poisson manifold with local coordinates $\{x^i\}$, and G be a "Riemannian metric" on the cotangent bundle T^*M, i.e. G defines a positive-definite bilinear form on the fiber of T^*M. Using the coordinate basis of 1-forms $\{dx^i\}$, the bilinear form is locally written as

$$G(\xi, \eta) = G^{ij}\xi_i\eta_j, \tag{2.5}$$

for any 1-forms ξ, $\eta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, where $G^{ij} := G(dx^i, dx^j)$. Its matrix inverse G_{ij}, i.e. $G_{ij}G^{jk} = \delta_i^k$, defines a metric on the tangent bundle TM, so that G^{-1} is an ordinary Riemannian metric.

Contravariant connection Since we regard the Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ as a fundamental object of the geometry of our interest, the notion of a connection is changed as follows [17].

Let E be a vector bundle over M. A contravariant connection on E is a linear map $\bar{\nabla} : \Gamma(E) \to \Gamma(TM \otimes E)$ satisfying

$$\bar{\nabla}(fs) = d_\theta f \otimes s + f\bar{\nabla}s, \tag{2.6}$$

for any section $s \in \Gamma(E)$ and function $f \in C^\infty(M)$. This is a generalization of the exterior derivative d_θ so as to act on a vector bundle E. We refer to $\bar{\nabla}s$ as the contravariant derivative of s.

Contravariant affine connection In particular, a contravariant connection on the cotangent bundle $E = T^*M$ should be called a contravariant affine connection. This is also understood as a bilinear map $\bar{\nabla} : \Gamma(T^*M) \times \Gamma(T^*M) \to \Gamma(T^*M)$; $(\xi, \eta) \mapsto \bar{\nabla}_\xi\eta$, such that, for any 1-forms ξ, η and function f,

$$\bar{\nabla}_{f\xi}\eta = f\bar{\nabla}_\xi\eta, \quad \bar{\nabla}_\xi(f\eta) = (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)\eta + f\bar{\nabla}_\xi\eta. \tag{2.7}$$

The point is that the argument ξ in the directional derivative $\bar{\nabla}_\xi$ is given by a 1-form. The connection coefficients with respect to the coordinate basis $\{dx^i\}$ are defined through

$$\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i}dx^j = \bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_k dx^k. \tag{2.8}$$

Hence, together with (2.7), we have

$$\bar{\nabla}_\xi\eta = \xi_i(\theta^{ij}\partial_j\eta_k + \bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_k\eta_j)dx^k, \tag{2.9}$$

for $\xi = \xi_i dx^i$ and $\eta = \eta_i dx^i$ in local coordinates $\{x^i\}$. It is worth comparing the formulae above with those obtained in the tangent bundle TM by using an ordinary affine connection ∇_X and connection coefficients $\nabla_i\partial_j = \Gamma^k_{ij}\partial_k$ with respect to the basis vectors $\{\partial_i\}$.

Contravariant torsion The torsion of a contravariant affine connection $\bar{\nabla}$ is defined by

$$\bar{T}(\xi,\eta) = \bar{\nabla}_\xi \eta - \bar{\nabla}_\eta \xi - [\xi,\eta]_\theta, \tag{2.10}$$

for any 1-forms ξ and η. Since it is manifestly skew-symmetric and satisfies

$$\bar{T}(f\xi,\eta) = f\bar{T}(\xi,\eta) = \bar{T}(\xi,f\eta), \tag{2.11}$$

$\bar{T}$ is a tensor in $\Gamma(\wedge^2 TM \otimes T^*M)$. We call $\bar{T}$ the contravariant torsion.

Contravariant Levi-Civita connection In the usual Riemannian geometry, the Levi-Civita connection ∇ on the tangent bundle TM is a unique torsion-free metric connection. In an analogous way, a contravariant affine connection $\bar{\nabla}$ is called a contravariant Levi-Civita connection, if it is compatible with the metric and torsion free:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi G(\eta,\zeta) &= G(\bar{\nabla}_\xi \eta,\zeta) + G(\eta,\bar{\nabla}_\xi \zeta), & (2.12)\\ \bar{T}(\xi,\eta) &= 0, & (2.13) \end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary 1-forms ξ, η and ζ.

We show that the contravariant Levi-Civita connection on T^*M is uniquely specified by the Koszul formula[6] [19–21]

$$\begin{aligned} 2G(\bar{\nabla}_\xi \eta,\zeta) = {}& \theta(\xi)\cdot G(\eta,\zeta) + \theta(\eta)\cdot G(\xi,\zeta) - \theta(\zeta)\cdot G(\xi,\eta) \\ & + G([\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta) + G([\zeta,\eta]_\theta,\xi) + G([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta). \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Through this formula, the connection is determined only by the Riemannian metric G on T^*M and the information of the Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ (i.e. the anchor map and the Koszul bracket).

In local coordinates, with the use of (2.8), the formula (2.14) yields

$$2G^{lk}\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_l = \theta^{il}\partial_l G^{jk} + \theta^{jl}\partial_l G^{ik} - \theta^{kl}\partial_l G^{ij} + G^{lj}\partial_l \theta^{ki} + G^{li}\partial_l \theta^{kj} + G^{lk}\partial_l \theta^{ij}. \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & G(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} dx^j, dx^k) = G(\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_l dx^l, dx^k) = G^{lk}\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_l, \\ & \theta(dx^i)\cdot G(dx^j,dx^k) = \theta^{il}\partial_l G^{jk}, \\ & G([dx^k,dx^i]_\theta, dx^j) = G(\partial_l \theta^{ki} dx^l, dx^j) = G^{lj}\partial_l \theta^{ki}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

By acting $G_{k'k}$ on both sides of (2.15) and rewriting k' to k, it is reduced to

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_k = \frac{1}{2}G_{nk}\left(\theta^{il}\partial_l G^{jn} + \theta^{jl}\partial_l G^{in} - \theta^{nl}\partial_l G^{ij} + G^{lj}\partial_l \theta^{ni} + G^{li}\partial_l \theta^{nj} + G^{ln}\partial_l \theta^{ij}\right). \tag{2.17}$$

In contrast to the usual Christoffel symbol Γ^k_{ij} that is specified only by the metric, the contravariant Christoffel symbol $\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_k$ (2.17) is determined by both the metric and the Poisson tensor.

---

[6] For a proof, see Appendix B.

Note that the condition of compatibility with the metric (2.12) written in local coordinates implies

$$\theta^{kl}\partial_l G^{ij} - \bar{\Gamma}^{ki}_{l} G^{lj} - \bar{\Gamma}^{kj}_{l} G^{il} = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

This equation will be rewritten in a more familiar expression $\bar{\nabla}_{dx^k} G^{ij} = 0$ in §2.3. The torsion-free condition (2.13) in terms of components indicates

$$\bar{T}^{ij}_{k} = \bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{ji}_{k} - \partial_k \theta^{ij} = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

Thus, it implies that the anti-symmetric part of the contravariant Christoffel symbol should not vanish

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{ji}_{k} = \partial_k \theta^{ij}. \tag{2.20}$$

This is a consequence of the non-vanishing Lie bracket $[dx^i, dx^j]_\theta = \partial_k \theta^{ij} dx^k$ of the coordinate basis, which is a significant difference from the ordinary Christoffel symbol Γ^k_{ij} using the standard Lie algebroid TM, where $[\partial_i, \partial_j]_{TM} = 0$[7].

Contravariant curvature The curvature of a contravariant affine connection $\bar{\nabla}$ is defined by

$$\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta = (\bar{\nabla}_\xi \bar{\nabla}_\eta - \bar{\nabla}_\eta \bar{\nabla}_\xi - \bar{\nabla}_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta})\zeta, \tag{2.21}$$

where ξ, η and $\zeta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$. It is easily shown that $\bar{R}$ is tensorial since it satisfies

$$\bar{R}(f\xi, g\eta)(h\zeta) = fgh\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta, \tag{2.22}$$

for any function f, g and h. Thus it defines a map $\bar{R} : \Gamma(T^*M) \otimes \Gamma(T^*M) \to \mathrm{End}(T^*M)$ and we will refer to it as contravariant curvature (Riemann) tensor hereafter.

For this curvature, together with the torsion $\bar{T}$, the following Bianchi identities hold[8]:

$$\mathfrak{S}\{\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta\} = \mathfrak{S}\{(\bar{\nabla}_\zeta \bar{T})(\xi,\eta) + \bar{T}(\bar{T}(\xi,\eta),\zeta)\}, \tag{2.23}$$

$$\mathfrak{S}\{(\bar{\nabla}_\zeta \bar{R})(\xi,\eta) + \bar{R}(\bar{T}(\xi,\eta),\zeta)\} = 0, \tag{2.24}$$

where $\mathfrak{S}$ denotes the cyclic sum over ξ, η, and ζ, e.g. $\mathfrak{S}\{\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta\} = \bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta + \bar{R}(\eta,\zeta)\xi + \bar{R}(\zeta,\xi)\eta$.

In local coordinates, the components of the curvature are read off from $\bar{R}(dx^i, dx^j)dx^k =: \bar{R}^{kij}_{l} dx^l$ and then we have

$$\bar{R}^{kij}_{l} = \theta^{im}\partial_m \bar{\Gamma}^{jk}_{l} - \theta^{jm}\partial_m \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_{l} - \partial_n \theta^{ij} \bar{\Gamma}^{nk}_{l} + \bar{\Gamma}^{jk}_{m} \bar{\Gamma}^{im}_{l} - \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_{m} \bar{\Gamma}^{jm}_{l}, \tag{2.25}$$

where $\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k}$ are connection coefficients, and are in particular given by (2.17) for the case of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection.

---

[7] The anti-symmetric part does not vanish in general for a non-holonomic frame $e_a = e^i_a \partial_i$ of TM.

[8] See Appendix B, for these derivations.

A contravariant analogue of the Ricci tensor is defined by contracting an upper index with a lower one:

$$\bar{R}^{kj} := \bar{R}_l^{klj}, \tag{2.26}$$

and an analogue of the scalar curvature is defined by taking the contraction between the metric G and the analogue of the Ricci tensor

$$\bar{R} := G_{kj}\bar{R}^{kj}. \tag{2.27}$$

2.3 Tensor calculus

In a geometry with an ordinary affine connection ∇ of the tangent bundle TM, the covariant derivative has a canonical extension that can act on any type of tensor field. A tensor field T of type (r,s) is a section of the tensor bundle $(TM)^{\otimes r} \otimes (T^*M)^{\otimes s}$, which is also characterized by the transformation rules under diffeomorphisms[9]. The covariant derivative ∇ is by definition a covariant object, in the sense that $\nabla_X T$ is an (r,s)-tensor field, if so T is. These facts serve as the basis of the tensor calculus.

In this subsection, we give similar arguments in the case of a contravariant affine connection.

Tensor fields We first need to introduce an appropriate notion of tensor fields. Fortunately, an ordinary tensor field T is automatically a tensor field for the contravariant case. This is due to the fact that the notion of tensor bundles is unchanged. Thus, for example, the contraction of a vector field X and a 1-form η, $\bar{\iota}_X\eta = X^j\eta_j$, is a scalar field, as usual. However, the infinitesimal transformation characterizing a tensor field is now given by the action of the Lie derivative $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta$ generated by any 1-form ζ. We call them β-diffeomorphisms according to [1].

By rewriting (2.3) in terms of local coordinates, we find that a vector field X and a 1-form η transform under a β-diffeomorphism generated by ζ, (here we denote $\partial^i = \theta^{ij}\partial_j$), respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta X^i &= \zeta_k\partial^k X^i + \partial^i\zeta_l X^l + \partial_l\theta^{ik}\zeta_k X^l,\\ \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \eta_j &= \zeta_k\partial^k\eta_j - \partial^l\zeta_j\eta_l - \partial_j\theta^{lk}\zeta_k\eta_l.\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

These formulae are also understood in more conventional way as follows.

The β-diffeomorphism acts on a coordinate function x^i as

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta x^i = -\bar{\iota}_\zeta\theta(dx^i) = \theta(\zeta, dx^i) = \theta^{ki}\zeta_k, \tag{2.29}$$

so that the first term of each equation in (2.28) comes from the shift of the argument $x^i \to x^i - \theta^{ki}\zeta_k$. It acts also on the coordinate basis dx^i of T^*M as

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta dx^i = [\zeta, dx^i]_\theta = ([\zeta, dx^i]_\theta)_j dx^j, \tag{2.30}$$

---

[9] As a transformation rule, we may either use a general coordinate transformation (passive) or a diffeomorphism (active). See a nice lecture [24] on this point.

so that the matrix $M(\zeta)$ of the change of basis in $dx^i \to dx^i + M(\zeta)^i_j dx^j$ is given by

$$M(\zeta)^i_j = ([\zeta, dx^i]_\theta)_j = -(\partial^i \zeta_j + \partial_j \theta^{il} \zeta_l). \tag{2.31}$$

The remaining terms in (2.28) are exactly the result of this change of basis, since they are rewritten in terms of $M(\zeta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta X^i &= \zeta_k \partial^k X^i - M(\zeta)^i_l X^l, \\ \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \eta_j &= \zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j + M(\zeta)^l_j \eta_l. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Thus, there are two familiar contributions to the change of vectors and 1-forms under an infinitesimal β-diffeomorphism (2.28): One is the shift of the argument and the other is the tensorial factor, as in the case of an ordinary infinitesimal diffeomorphisms[10].

With this observation, an extension to characterize tensor fields is canonically achieved: An (r, s)-tensor field T transforms under the above β-diffeomorphism as

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} = \zeta_k \partial^k T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} - \sum_{p=1}^{r} M(\zeta)^{i_p}_l T^{i_1 \cdots l \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} + \sum_{q=1}^{s} M(\zeta)^l_{j_q} T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots l \cdots j_s}. \tag{2.33}$$

Note that the roles of upper and lower indices are switched and there appear relative signs, as compared to the ordinary transformation law of an (r, s)-tensor field T under diffeomorphism. In spite of such differences, the notion of contraction between upper and lower indices of tensors still works, since only the indices that are not contracted determine the transformation properties under β-diffeomorphisms. For instance, $X^j \eta_j$ transforms as a scalar field

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta (X^j \eta_j) &= (\zeta_k \partial^k X^j - M(\zeta)^j_l X^l)\eta_j + X^j (\zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j + M(\zeta)^l_j \eta_l) \\ &= \zeta_k \partial^k (X^j \eta_j), \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

and $G^{ij} \eta_j$ transforms as a vector field, and so on.

Contravariant derivative The actions of the contravariant derivative of an affine connection $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta$ on the components of a vector field, X^i, and a 1-form, η_j, are written by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nabla}_\zeta \eta_j &= \zeta_k \bar{\nabla}_{dx^k} \eta_j = \zeta_k \left(\partial^k \eta_j + \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j \eta_l \right), \\ \bar{\nabla}_\zeta X^i &= \zeta_k \bar{\nabla}_{dx^k} X^i = \zeta_k \left(\partial^k X^i - \bar{\Gamma}^{ki}_l X^l \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

respectively. The former comes from the connection on T^*M, given in (2.9). The latter comes from the induced connection on the dual bundle TM, which is determined by the compatibility of the contravariant derivative with the contraction:

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta (X^j \eta_j) = (\bar{\nabla}_\zeta X^j) \eta_j + X^j (\bar{\nabla}_\zeta \eta_j). \tag{2.36}$$

---

[10] Note that in the ordinary case, the shift $x^i \to x^i + \epsilon^i$ and the change of basis $dx^i \to dx^i + \partial_j \epsilon^i dx^j$ are essentially the same because of $[\mathcal{L}_\epsilon, d] = 0$, while in our case they are not due to $[\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta, d] \neq 0$

From the formulae (2.35), the action of the contravariant derivative is straightforwardly extended to an (r, s)-tensor field T[11]:

$$\bar{\nabla}_\zeta T^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s} = \zeta_k \left(\partial^k T^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s} - \sum_{p=1}^{r} \bar{\Gamma}^{k i_p}_{l} T^{i_1\cdots l\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s} + \sum_{q=1}^{s} \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_{j_q} T^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots l\cdots j_s} \right). \tag{2.37}$$

Note again that the indices' structures are flipped and the relative signs appear as compared to the case of the usual covariant derivative. In the case of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection, the connection coefficients are specified by (2.17).

By definition, $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta \eta_j$ should transform as components of a 1-form. In order to achieve this, the connection coefficients are found to transform under the β-diffeomorphism not as a tensor but as

$$\delta_\zeta \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j = \zeta_k \partial^k \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j + M(\zeta)^k_j \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_k - M(\zeta)^i_k \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j - M(\zeta)^l_k \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j - \partial^i M(\zeta)^l_j. \tag{2.38}$$

For details, see Appendix B. The first term comes form the shift of the argument, the three terms in the middle are the tensor factors, and the last term is a non-tensorial factor, peculiar to the connection coefficients. By using this property, it is possible to show that the contravariant derivative of any other tensor $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta T^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s}$ transforms as an (r, s)-tensor again, see Appendix B.

Contravariant derivative of G and θ There are two characteristic tensor fields G^{ij} and θ^{ij} in the present formulation. It follows from (2.37) that the contravariant derivative of the metric reads

$$\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} G^{mn} = \theta^{il} \partial_l G^{mn} - \bar{\Gamma}^{im}_l G^{ln} - \bar{\Gamma}^{in}_l G^{ml}. \tag{2.39}$$

As mentioned in (2.18), it automatically vanishes, i.e. $\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} G^{mn} = 0$, for the case of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection (2.17), owing to the metric-compatibility condition.

The contravariant derivative of the Poisson tensor is

$$\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} \theta^{mn} = \theta^{il} \partial_l \theta^{mn} - \bar{\Gamma}^{im}_l \theta^{ln} - \bar{\Gamma}^{in}_l \theta^{ml}, \tag{2.40}$$

which does not vanish even for the case of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection. However, permuting the indices of (2.40) cyclically and taking their sum, we see that

$$\bar{\nabla}_{dx^k} \theta^{ij} + \bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} \theta^{jk} + \bar{\nabla}_{dx^j} \theta^{ki} = 0, \tag{2.41}$$

with the use of the Poisson condition $\theta^{m[i}\partial_m \theta^{jk]} = 0$ and (2.20). This result is not an accidental one but is a consequence of the torsion-free condition, as seen below.

In general, the exterior derivative d_θ acting on any polyvector can be written in terms of a contravariant affine connection $\bar{\nabla}$, if it is torsion-free[12]. For example, for a vector field X, we find

---

[11] For a detailed analysis, see appendix B.

[12] There is a similar statement for the case of de Rham's exterior differential d and an affine connection ∇ acting on differential forms.

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\theta X(\xi,\eta) &= \theta(\xi)\cdot X(\eta) - \theta(\eta)\cdot X(\xi) - X([\xi,\eta]_\theta) \\
&= (\bar\nabla_\xi X)(\eta) + X(\bar\nabla_\xi \eta) - (\bar\nabla_\eta X)(\xi) - X(\bar\nabla_\eta \xi) - X([\xi,\eta]_\theta) \\
&= (\bar\nabla_\xi X)(\eta) - (\bar\nabla_\eta X)(\xi) + X(\bar\nabla_\xi \eta - \bar\nabla_\eta \xi - [\xi,\eta]_\theta) \\
&= (\bar\nabla_\xi X)(\eta) - (\bar\nabla_\eta X)(\xi), \qquad (2.42)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality we used the definition of d_θ, and in the last equality we made use of the torsion-free condition. Similarly, for $\theta \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\theta\theta(\xi,\eta,\zeta) &= \theta(\xi)\cdot\theta(\eta,\zeta) + \theta(\eta)\cdot\theta(\zeta,\xi) + \theta(\zeta)\cdot\theta(\xi,\eta) - \theta([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta) - \theta([\eta,\zeta]_\theta,\xi) - \theta([\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta) \\
&= (\bar\nabla_\xi\theta)(\eta,\zeta) + (\bar\nabla_\eta\theta)(\zeta,\xi) + (\bar\nabla_\zeta\theta)(\xi,\eta) \\
&\quad + \theta(\bar\nabla_\xi\eta - \bar\nabla_\eta\xi - [\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta) + \theta(\bar\nabla_\eta\zeta - \bar\nabla_\zeta\eta - [\eta,\zeta]_\theta,\xi) + \theta(\bar\nabla_\zeta\xi - \bar\nabla_\xi\zeta - [\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta) \\
&= (\bar\nabla_\xi\theta)(\eta,\zeta) + (\bar\nabla_\eta\theta)(\zeta,\xi) + (\bar\nabla_\zeta\theta)(\xi,\eta). \qquad (2.43)
\end{aligned}$$

This means, in components, that

$$d_\theta\theta = \frac{1}{3!}(\bar\nabla_{dx^k}\theta^{ij} + \bar\nabla_{dx^i}\theta^{jk} + \bar\nabla_{dx^j}\theta^{ki})\partial_k\wedge\partial_i\wedge\partial_j \qquad (2.44)$$

Thus, the Poisson condition $[\theta,\theta]_S = 0$, in terms of components, $\theta^{m[i}\partial_m\theta^{jk]} = 0$, is equivalent to (2.41) as mentioned above.

2.4 Ordinary Levi-Civita connection as contravariant affine connection

Before closing this section, here we give a possible interpretation of the contravariant Christoffel symbol $\bar\Gamma^{ij}_k$ (2.17), by rewriting it in terms of the ordinary Christoffel symbol Γ^k_{ij}. This rewriting is possible, since the derivative of the metric G can be written as

$$\partial_m G^{ij} = -\Gamma^i_{ml}G^{lj} - \Gamma^j_{ml}G^{il}, \qquad (2.45)$$

using the ordinary Christoffel symbol Γ^k_{ij}. Substituting (2.45) into the formula of the contravariant Christoffel symbol (2.17), we find

$$\bar\Gamma^{ij}_k = \Gamma^j_{mk}\theta^{mi} + K^{ij}_k. \qquad (2.46)$$

Here, we introduced a tensor K^{ij}_k defined by

$$K_k{}^{ij} = G_{kn}K^{nij}, \quad K^{kij} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla^k\theta^{ij} - \nabla^i\theta^{jk} + \nabla^j\theta^{ki}\right), \qquad (2.47)$$

where ∇ denotes the ordinary Levi-Civita connection and the raising and lowering of indices is done by the metric G as usual, e.g. $\nabla^i = G^{ij}\nabla_j$.

In eq. (2.46), Γ^j_{km} is the ordinary Christoffel symbol associated with the directional derivative ∇_X along a vector field $X \in \Gamma(TM)$. However, if $X = \theta(\xi)$ for some 1-form $\zeta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, then $\nabla_X = \nabla_{\theta(\xi)}$ might also be regarded as a contravariant derivative in the ξ-direction. The combination $\Gamma^j_{km}\theta^{mi}$ appearing in (2.46) is indeed understood in this way. That is, $\nabla_{\theta(\cdot)}$ defines another contravariant connection [18], and the formula (2.46) indicates the difference between the two contravariant affine connections

$$\nabla_{\theta(\cdot)} = \bar{\nabla} + K. \tag{2.48}$$

For example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta(\xi)} X &= \bar{\nabla}_\xi X + K(\xi, X), \\ \nabla_{\theta(\xi)} \eta &= \bar{\nabla}_\xi \eta + K(\xi, \eta). \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

In general, the difference of any two contravariant affine connections should be an endmorphism-valued vector field. Thus ${K_k}^{ij}$ should be a component of the tensor $K \in \Gamma(T^*M \otimes TM \otimes TM)$. In particular, since $\bar{\nabla}$ is the contravariant Levi-Civita connection, the difference K should be referred to as a (contravariant version of the) contorsion tensor. In fact, we can compute the contravariant torsion (2.10) associated with the contravariant affine connection $\nabla_{\theta(\cdot)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T(\xi, \eta) &= \nabla_{\theta(\xi)}\eta - \nabla_{\theta(\eta)}\xi - [\xi, \eta]_\theta \\ &= \bar{\nabla}_\xi \eta - \bar{\nabla}_\eta \xi - [\xi, \eta]_\theta + K(\xi, \eta) - K(\eta, \xi) \\ &= K(\xi, \eta) - K(\eta, \xi), \end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

which is in components

$$T^{ij}_k = {K_k}^{ij} - {K_k}^{ji} = \nabla_k \theta^{ij}. \tag{2.51}$$

Thus, the relation between the contorsion tensor K and the torsion tensor T is obtained as usual.

In constructing a gravity theory in the present framework using contravariant connections, the theory based on the contravariant Levi-Civita $\bar{\nabla}$ would correspond to the contravariant analogue of Einstein's general relativity, while the theory based on the metric affine $\nabla_{\theta(\cdot)}$ corresponds to a contravariant version of the Einstein-Cartan theory of gravity, equipped with a torsion.

On the other hand, the relation (2.46) could provide another description of our current framework from the viewpoint of the ordinary framework using covariant connections: a deformation of general relativity by a matter field θ^{ij}. Let us rewrite the contravariant curvature tensors in the previous subsection by using (2.46). After some lengthy computation, see appendix B, we obtain the contravariant Riemann curvature as

$$\bar{R}^{kij}_l = \theta^{im}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn} - (\nabla_n\theta^{ij})K^{nk}_l + \theta^{nj}\nabla_n K^{ik}_l - \theta^{ni}\nabla_n K^{jk}_l + K^{jk}_m K^{im}_l - K^{ik}_m K^{jm}_l, \tag{2.52}$$

where R^k_{lmn} denotes the ordinary Riemann curvature tensor made out of the metric G. By using the expression (2.52), the contravariant Ricci tensor and the scalar curvature are also written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{R}^{kj} = \theta^{lm}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn} - (\nabla_n\theta^{lj})K^{nk}_l + \theta^{nj}\nabla_n\nabla_l\theta^{lk} - \theta^{nl}\nabla_n K^{jk}_l + K^{jk}_m\nabla_l\theta^{lm} - K^{lk}_m K^{jm}_l, \\ &\bar{R} = \theta^{lm}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}_{jlmn} + 2\theta_{nm}\nabla^n\nabla_l\theta^{lm} - \nabla^n\theta_{nm}\nabla_l\theta^{lm}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

Thus, the appearance of these expressions in an ordinary gravity theory suggests the existence of a dual description based on a contravariant connection.

As a particular case, when the contravariant contorsion tensor vanishes, $K^{ijk} = 0$, the contravariant curvatures reduces to the Riemann curvature, up to a multiplications by θ. This happens if $\nabla^n \theta^{ij} = 0$, i.e. the Poisson tensor is covariantly constant. This is because the requirement $K^{ijk} = 0$ implies that

$$\nabla^n \theta^{ij} = \nabla^i \theta^{jn} + \nabla^j \theta^{in}. \tag{2.54}$$

By noticing that the left-hand side is skew-symmetric under the interchange of indices $\{i, j\}$, whereas the right-hand side is symmetric, it follows that $\nabla^n \theta^{ij} = 0$. This class of geometry is studied in [19–21] under the name of a Riemann-Poisson manifold[13]. This is realized, for example, when the manifold is equipped with a Kähler structure, where the Poisson tensor is induced by the corresponding symplectic form.

3 Gravity theory based on Poisson Generalized Geometry

In this section, we address the construction of a gravity theory on a Poisson manifold in the framework of the Poisson Generalized Geometry (PGG) [1], where the Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ is the main object under consideration. Applying Hitchin's constructions of a Generalized Riemannian geometry for the standard Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$ [15] to our case, we show that the connection, the curvature, etc. can be constructed in an analogous way. In particular, the R-flux formulated in PGG [1] appears as a torsion, similarly as the H-flux does. After investigating an invariant integration measure, we will give an analogue of the Einstein-Hilbert action on a Poisson manifold. For reference purposes, we give a brief review on related issues of [15] in appendix A.

3.1 Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$

Consider a vector bundle $TM \oplus T^*M$ equipped with a canonical inner product defined for any vector fields X, Y and 1-forms ξ, η with $X + \xi, Y + \eta \in \Gamma(TM \oplus T^*M)$ as

$$\langle X + \xi, Y + \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\iota}_\xi Y + \bar{\iota}_\eta X), \tag{3.1}$$

with an anchor map $\rho : TM \oplus T^*M \to TM$

$$\rho(X + \xi) = \theta(\xi), \tag{3.2}$$

and a skew-symmetric bracket

$$[X + \xi, Y + \eta] = [\xi, \eta]_\theta + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi Y - \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta X - \frac{1}{2} d_\theta(\bar{\iota}_\xi Y - \bar{\iota}_\eta X). \tag{3.3}$$

---

[13] In the literatures, the author's definition $\mathcal{D}\pi = 0$ is equivalent to $\nabla^n \theta^{ij} = 0$.

Then the quadruple $(TM \oplus T^*M, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, \rho, [\cdot,\cdot])$ defines a Courant algebroid, which we denote as $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ for short. Its fundamental properties were investigated in [1] under the name of a Poisson Generalized Geometry. There are two kinds of transformations in this algebroid: β-transformations

$$e^{\beta}(X+\xi) = X + \xi + i_\xi \beta, \tag{3.4}$$

where β is a bi-vector $\beta \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$, and the β-diffeomorphisms

$$e^{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta}(X+\xi) = e^{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta}X + e^{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta}\xi, \tag{3.5}$$

which is generated by any 1-form $\zeta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$. A β-transformation implies the relation

$$[e^{\beta}(X+\xi), e^{\beta}(Y+\eta)] = e^{\beta}\left([X+\xi, Y+\eta] + \bar{\iota}_\eta \bar{\iota}_\xi d_\theta \beta\right). \tag{3.6}$$

Thus the β-transformation is a symmetry of the bracket if β is d_θ-closed. In particular, we call a β-transformation as a β-gauge transformation if β is d_θ-exact. For more details, see [1][14].

It is shown that the bracket (3.3) satisfies the following relations

$$[u, fv] = f[u,v] + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)v - (d_\theta f)\langle u, v\rangle, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \langle v, w\rangle = \langle [u,v] + d_\theta\langle u,v\rangle, w\rangle + \langle v, [u,w] + d_\theta \langle u,w\rangle\rangle, \tag{3.8}$$

where $u = X+\xi$, $v = Y+\eta$, $w = Z+\zeta \in (TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$, and f is any smooth function[15]. They stem from (combinations of) the axioms of a Courant algebroid [25, 26]. For their proof, see appendix B. These properties are crucial in defining a connection which is compatible with $O(n,n)$-invariant inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ as we shall see in the following subsection.

***R*-flux** In [1], an R-flux is defined as a dual analogue of an H-flux [27, 28] in $TM \oplus T^*M$. It is a trivector $R \in \Gamma(\wedge^3 TM)$ and is an Abelian field strength associated with the local β-gauge symmetry. The R-flux is written locally by a set of gauge field bivectors $\beta_\alpha \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TU_\alpha)$ as

$$R|_{U_\alpha} = d_\theta \beta_\alpha, \tag{3.9}$$

on an open set U_α of M. Note that a β-gauge transformation $\beta_\alpha \to \beta_\alpha + d_\theta \Lambda_\alpha$ keeps R invariant.

An R-flux[16] is used to deform the structure of the Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$, which is called an R-twisting. On one hand, R defines an R-twisted Courant algebroid E which satisfies the exact sequence

$$0 \to (TM)_0 \to E \to (T^*M)_\theta \to 0, \tag{3.10}$$

---

[14] The condition $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \theta = 0$ for ζ is needed to preserve the anchor map, but it is not required in the following argument.

[15] Note that in (3.8) the right-hand side seems to depend on both vector field X and 1-form ξ, although the left-hand side depends only on 1-form ξ. We can show, however, that the terms involving X in the right-hand side cancel and thus the right-hand side is independent of X.

[16] More precisely, its class is in the third Poisson cohomology $[R] \in H^3_\theta(M)$.

with the same bracket as (3.3). On the other hand, R defines a Courant algebroid $(TM \oplus T^*M, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, \rho, [\cdot,\cdot]_R)$ with the R-twisted bracket

$$[X+\xi, Y+\eta]_R = [X+\xi, Y+\eta] + \bar{\iota}_\eta \bar{\iota}_\xi R. \tag{3.11}$$

It is shown in [1] that these two deformations are equivalent, that is, there is an isomorphism $\varphi : TM \oplus T^*M \to E$ of Courant algebroids, which comes essentially from the local version of the formula (3.6). In the following, we adopt the latter description of the R-twisting. When an R-flux is present, we still denote the Courant algebroid as $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ but with the R-twisted bracket (3.11).

Since the definition and the appearance of an R-flux are analogous to those of an H-flux in standard GG, we expect that an R-flux plays a role analogous to the one of an H-flux in the gravity theory.

3.2 Generalized Riemannian structure

As in the standard Generalized Geometry, a generalized Riemannian structure is defined as a maximally positive-definite subbundle C_+ of the bundle $TM \oplus T^*M$, where the positivity is defined with respect to the inner product (3.1). Together with its orthogonal complement C_-, we thus have $TM \oplus T^*M = C_+ \oplus C_-$.

In general, the subbundles $C_\pm$ are given by graphs associated with maps $\pm G + \beta : T^*M \to TM$

$$C_\pm = \{\xi + (\pm G + \beta)(\xi) \mid \xi \in T^*M\}, \tag{3.12}$$

respectively [1]. Here the symmetric part G of the maps is a Riemannian metric on T^*M, since the inner product of elements in C_+ reduces to the Riemannian metric on T^*M, as $\langle \xi + (G+\beta)(\xi), \eta + (G+\beta)(\eta)\rangle = G(\xi,\eta)$. The skew-symmetric part $\beta \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$ is a bivector on M. We can simplify an argument concerning this bivector β, by recognizing (3.12) as the result of performing a β-transformation e^β (3.4) on the bundle

$$C'_\pm = \{\xi \pm G(\xi) \mid \xi \in T^*M\}. \tag{3.13}$$

According to the formula (3.6), there is an isomorphism between these two Courant algebroids, $e^\beta : C'_+ \oplus C'_- \to C_+ \oplus C_-$, where the bracket of the former is $[X+\xi, Y+\eta]_{R+d_\theta\beta}$. Thus, by redefining the β-gauge potential as $\beta_\alpha \to \beta_\alpha + \beta$ on each open set U_α, the effect the bivector β is absorbed into a replacement of the R-twisted bracket. In the same manner, a further β-transformation $e^{\tilde{\beta}}$ with $d_\theta\tilde{\beta} = 0$ might also be absorbed into a redefinition of the bracket, but it does not change the bracket at all. This is understood as a gauge transformation of the β-gauge potential.

In this way, a choice of a Riemannian metric G on T^*M is translated into a choice of the subbundle C'_+ of the form (3.13), which we denote C_+ hereafter, omitting the prime. Note that this observation, together with the replacement of the bracket with the twisted bracket, plays an important role in the construction of the gravity theory on the standard Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$ [15].

Projections and lifts In order to represent the sections of the subbundles $C_\pm$, we introduce two kinds of maps [15], which we call projections and lifts. We define the lifts $^\pm : \Gamma(T^*M) \to \Gamma(C_\pm)$ and $^\pm : \Gamma(TM) \to \Gamma(C_\pm)$, respectively, by

$$\xi^\pm := \xi \pm G(\xi), \quad X^\pm := X \pm G^{-1}(X), \tag{3.14}$$

for any 1-form ξ and vector field X. In the latter, we used the fact that $C_\pm$ are also written as $C_\pm = \{X \pm G^{-1}(X) \mid X \in TM\}$. The projections $\pi_\pm : \Gamma(TM \oplus T^*M) \to \Gamma(C_\pm)$ are canonically defined. By noting $\pi_\pm(X) = \frac{1}{2}\pi_\pm(X + G^{-1}(X) + X - G^{-1}(X)) = \frac{1}{2}(X \pm G^{-1}(X))$, and $\pi_\pm(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\pi_\pm(\xi + G(\xi) + \xi - G(\xi)) = \frac{1}{2}(\xi \pm G(\xi))$, the projections are written in terms of the lifts as well:

$$\pi_\pm(X + \xi) = \frac{1}{2}(X^\pm + \xi^\pm). \tag{3.15}$$

3.3 Contravariant connection, torsion and curvature

In this subsection we define a contravariant connection and its torsion and curvature on the positive-definite subbundle C_+ of the Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ equipped with an R-twisted bracket. The definitions are the contravariant analogue of those given by Hitchin for the standard Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$ [15].

Contravariant connection Let $\bar{D}$ be a bilinear map $\bar{D} : \Gamma(T^*M \otimes C_+) \to \Gamma(C_+)$ defined by

$$\bar{D}_\xi(u) := \pi_+\big([\xi^-, u]_R\big), \tag{3.16}$$

where $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*M)$ and $u \in \Gamma(C_+)$. Then, the following properties are satisfied

$$\bar{D}_{f\xi}(u) = f\bar{D}_\xi(u), \tag{3.17}$$

$$\bar{D}_\xi(fu) = f\bar{D}_\xi(u) + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)u, \tag{3.18}$$

for any smooth function f (For a proof, see appendix B.). Hence, the map $\bar{D}$ defines a contravariant connection (2.6) on the bundle C_+.

Furthermore, we can show that $\bar{D}$ is compatible with the canonical $O(d,d)$-invariant inner product (3.1):

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi\langle u, v\rangle = \langle \bar{D}_\xi(u), v\rangle + \langle u, \bar{D}_\xi(v)\rangle, \tag{3.19}$$

for any u and $v \in \Gamma(C_+)$ (see appendix B).

Contravariant torsion The torsion associated with the contravariant connection $\bar{D}$ can also be defined in a parallel manner with [15], although $\bar{D}$ is not an affine connection. For ξ and $\eta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, we define the contravariant torsion $\bar{\tau} : \Gamma(\wedge^2 T^*M) \to \Gamma(C_+)$ by

$$\bar{\tau}(\xi, \eta) = \bar{D}_\xi(\eta^+) - \bar{D}_\eta(\xi^+) - ([\xi, \eta]_\theta)^+, \tag{3.20}$$

which is actually tensorial since, with the use of the formula (B.48), it satisfies

$$\bar{\tau}(f\xi, g\eta) = fg\bar{\tau}(\xi, \eta). \tag{3.21}$$

Contravariant curvature We define the curvature of $\bar{D}$ as a map $\bar{\Omega} : \Gamma(\wedge^2 T^*M) \to \Gamma(\mathrm{End}(C_+))$ by

$$\bar{\Omega}(\xi, \eta)u = (\bar{D}_\xi \bar{D}_\eta - \bar{D}_\eta \bar{D}_\xi - \bar{D}_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta})u, \tag{3.22}$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$ and $u \in \Gamma(C_+)$. It satisfies the tensorial property (see appendix B),

$$\bar{\Omega}(f\xi, g\eta)(hu) = fgh\bar{\Omega}(\xi, \eta)u. \tag{3.23}$$

In summary, the contravariant connection as well as torsion and the curvature are consistently defined on C_+. Note that in the proofs of their well-definedness, we merely utilized the properties (3.7) and (3.8), coming from the axioms of Courant algebroids. Thus, these constructions are also applicable to any Courant algebroid. To elaborate on the characteristic properties in our case, we next examine the local expressions of these objects with the full-use of the R-twisted bracket.

3.4 Local expressions

In this subsection, we present the local expressions of the objects in the previous section. In particular, we show that the contravariant connection $\bar{D}$ on C_+ is the lift of a contravariant metric affine connection on T^*M. In local coordinates, we take the coordinate basis as $\{dx^i\}$ for T^*M. Then, by applying the lift, $\{(dx^i)^+ = dx^i + G^{ij}\partial_j\}$ are the basis of C_+.

Contravariant connection First we shall calculate the connection (3.16) for $\xi = dx^i$ and for $u = (dx^j)^+$,

$$\bar{D}_{dx^i}(dx^j)^+ = \pi_+([(dx^i)^-, (dx^j)^+] + \bar{\iota}_{dx^j}\bar{\iota}_{dx^i}R). \tag{3.24}$$

We can read off the connection coefficients from $\bar{D}_{dx^i}(dx^j)^+ = \bar{\Upsilon}^{ij}_{k}(dx^k)^+$ as

$$\bar{\Upsilon}^{ij}_{k} = \bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k} + \frac{1}{2}R^{ijn}G_{nk}, \tag{3.25}$$

where $\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k}$ is the contravariant Christoffel symbol (2.17) of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection, and R^{ijn} is the R-flux.

To show this, we note that the bracket in the first term in (3.24) is evaluated by using (3.3) as[17]

$$\begin{aligned} &[dx^i - G^{ik}\partial_k, dx^j + G^{jl}\partial_l] \\ &= \partial_k\theta^{ij}dx^k + [\theta^{mn}(\partial_m G^{ji}) - \theta^{mi}(\partial_m G^{jn}) - \theta^{mj}(\partial_m G^{in}) - G^{jl}(\partial_l\theta^{in}) - G^{il}(\partial_l\theta^{jn})]\partial_n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Acting the projection π_+ on the above expression and noting (3.15), which implies $\pi_+(dx^k) = \frac{1}{2}(dx^k)^+$ and $\pi_+(G^{nk}\partial_n) = \frac{1}{2}(dx^k)^+$, the first term of the connection coefficients (3.24) is nothing but the contravariant Christoffel symbol (2.17):

---

[17] For computational details, see appendix B.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_+([(dx^i)^-, (dx^j)^+] \\
=&\frac{1}{2}[\partial_k\theta^{ij} + G_{nk}(\theta^{mk}\partial_m G^{ij} - \theta^{mi}\partial_m G^{jk} - \theta^{mj}\partial_m G^{ki} - G^{jm}\partial_m\theta^{ik} - G^{im}\partial_m\theta^{jk})](dx^k)^+ \\
=&\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k}(dx^k)^+. \qquad (3.27)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the metric compatibility (2.12) of $\bar{\nabla}$ is equivalent to (3.19). Thus, when the R-flux is absent, the contravariant connection $\bar{D}$ on C_+ is the lift of the contravariant Levi-Civita connection $\bar{\nabla}$ on T^*M.

Since R in (3.24) is a trivector[18], $R = \frac{1}{3!}R^{ijn}\partial_i \wedge \partial_j \wedge \partial_n$, we can straightforwardly evaluate the second term of (3.24) as

$$\pi_+(\bar{\iota}_{dx^j}\bar{\iota}_{dx^i}R) = \pi_+(R^{ijn}\partial_n) = R^{ijn}G_{nk}\pi_+(G^{kl}\partial_l) = \frac{1}{2}R^{ijn}G_{nk}(dx^k)^+. \qquad (3.28)$$

In summary, we obtain the explicit form of the contravariant connection on C_+ as

$$\bar{D}_{dx^i}(dx^j)^+ = \left(\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k} + \frac{1}{2}R^{ijn}G_{nk}\right)(dx^k)^+. \qquad (3.29)$$

It is the lift of a contravariant metric affine connection on T^*M.

Contravariant torsion The components of the torsion tensor (3.20) is obtained by computing

$$\bar{\tau}(dx^i, dx^j) = \bar{\tau}^{ij}_{k}(dx^k)^+, \qquad (3.30)$$

and is written in terms of $\bar{\Upsilon}^{ij}_{k}$ in (3.25) as

$$\bar{\tau}^{ij}_{k} = \bar{\Upsilon}^{ij}_{k} - \bar{\Upsilon}^{ji}_{k} - \partial_k\theta^{ij}. \qquad (3.31)$$

This implies that the torsion tensor of $\bar{D}$ is also the lift of the torsion tensor $\bar{T}$ (2.10) of the contravariant affine connection $\bar{\nabla}$. In fact, from (3.25) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\tau}^{ij}_{k} &= (\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_{k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{ji}_{k} - \partial_k\theta^{ij}) + R^{ijn}G_{nk} \\
&= R^{ijn}G_{nk}, \qquad (3.32)
\end{aligned}$$

where (2.19) is used. Thus, the contravariant Levi-Civita part of the connection $\bar{\Upsilon}^{ij}_{k}$ does not contribute to the torsion $\bar{\tau}$, whereas the R-flux does. This is parallel to the case of the standard generalized geometry, where an H-flux appears as the torsion of the generalized Bismut connection [16].

---

[18] Because R is written by a local bivector potential as $R = d_\theta\beta_\alpha = [\theta, \beta_\alpha]_S$, its components are also written as

$$R^{ijn} = \theta^{nm}\partial_m\beta^{ij}_\alpha + \theta^{im}\partial_m\beta^{jn}_\alpha + \theta^{jm}\partial_m\beta^{ni}_\alpha + \beta^{nm}_\alpha\partial_m\theta^{ij} + \beta^{im}_\alpha\partial_m\theta^{jn} + \beta^{jm}_\alpha\partial_m\theta^{ni}.$$

Contravariant curvature The components of the curvature tensor (3.22) are found by

$$\bar{\Omega}(dx^i, dx^j)(dx^k)^+ = \bar{\Omega}_l^{kij}(dx^l)^+, \tag{3.33}$$

and are written in terms of (3.25) as

$$\bar{\Omega}_l^{kij} = \theta^{im}\partial_m \bar{\Upsilon}_l^{jk} - \theta^{jm}\partial_m \bar{\Upsilon}_l^{ik} - \partial_n \theta^{ij} \bar{\Upsilon}_l^{nk} + \bar{\Upsilon}_m^{jk}\bar{\Upsilon}_l^{im} - \bar{\Upsilon}_m^{ik}\bar{\Upsilon}_l^{jm}. \tag{3.34}$$

Of course, for the case of a vanishing R-flux ($R^{ijn} = 0$ in (3.25)), this reduces to the contravariant Riemann tensor (2.25):

$$\bar{R}_l^{kij} = \theta^{im}\partial_m \bar{\Gamma}_l^{jk} - \theta^{jm}\partial_m \bar{\Gamma}_l^{ik} - \partial_n \theta^{ij} \bar{\Gamma}_l^{nk} + \bar{\Gamma}_m^{jk}\bar{\Gamma}_l^{im} - \bar{\Gamma}_m^{ik}\bar{\Gamma}_l^{jm}. \tag{3.35}$$

The remaining terms in (3.34) should be written by a combination of tensors. Explicitly, we find[19]

$$\bar{\Omega}_l^{kij} = \bar{R}_l^{kij} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i} R^{jkn} - \bar{\nabla}_{dx^j} R^{ikn}\right) G_{nl} + \frac{1}{4} G_{nm}\left(R^{jkn}R^{imp} - R^{ikn}R^{jmp}\right) G_{pl}. \tag{3.36}$$

Generalized contravariant Ricci tensor and Ricci scalar Since the index structure of $\bar{\Omega}_l^{kij}$ is the same as the contravariant Riemann tensor, we define the corresponding Ricci tensor and the Ricci scalar in the same way as (2.26) and (2.27), respectively, prefixing the term "generalized" with them: The generalized contravariant Ricci tensor $\bar{\Omega}^{kj}$ is obtained from (3.36) as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Omega}^{kj} :=& \bar{\Omega}_l^{klj} \\ =& \bar{R}^{kj} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\nabla}_{dx^l} R^{jkn} G_{nl} + \frac{1}{4} G_{nm}\left(R^{jkn}R^{lmp} - R^{lkn}R^{jmp}\right) G_{pl},\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

with $\bar{R}^{kj}$ being (2.26); the generalized contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{\Omega}$ is given by

$$\bar{\Omega} := G_{kj}\bar{\Omega}^{kj} = \bar{R} - \frac{1}{4}R^2, \tag{3.38}$$

where $\bar{R}$ is given in (2.27) and R^2 denotes

$$R^2 = G_{il}G_{jm}G_{kn}R^{ijk}R^{lmn}. \tag{3.39}$$

Thus the generalized contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{\Omega}$ is given by a sum of the contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{R}$, and the square of the R-flux. Since the contravariant Levi-Civita part is defined independently of the presence of R-fluxes, we may consider a particular case of $R = 0$ without any problem. The outcome (3.38) has the same structure as the generalized Ricci scalar obtained in standard Generalized Geometry, where the generalized Ricci scalar consists of the ordinary Ricci scalar and the square of the H-flux, see appendix A.

---

[19] See, Appendix B.

3.5 Invariant measure

Towards the construction of an action for a gravity theory that is relevant to our geometry, we would like to determine an appropriate invariant measure, or equivalently a volume form. In this subsection, we argue that if the Poisson manifold M is unimodular, there is a measure such that the integrations of scalar functions are invariant under β-diffeomorphisms.

To clarify this, we shall recall first the notion of an invariant measure in the ordinary general relativity. If we assume that the n-dimensional manifold M is orientable, we can always choose a volume form (nowhere vanishing top form) $\Sigma \in \Gamma(\wedge^n T^*M)$, written in local coordinates,

$$\Sigma = \rho dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^n. \tag{3.40}$$

Under a diffeomorphism generated by a vector field $X = X^i \partial_i$, it transforms as

$$\mathcal{L}_X \Sigma = d(i_X \Sigma) = \partial_i(\rho X^i) dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^n. \tag{3.41}$$

which is a total divergence (d-exact top form). Hence, the integration of a scalar function f (i.e., ρf is a Lagrangian density) over the manifold M is diffeomorphism invariant

$$\int_M \mathcal{L}_X(\Sigma f) = \int \partial_i(\rho X^i f) d^n x = 0, \tag{3.42}$$

provided that the surface integral vanishes. In particular, if X is divergence free, $div_\Sigma X = \frac{1}{\rho}\partial_i(\rho X^i) = 0$, the volume form Σ itself is invariant. On a Riemannian manifold M equipped with a metric G, it is conventional to set

$$\rho = \sqrt{\det G}. \tag{3.43}$$

In our case of the gravity on a Poisson manifold, we would like to introduce a volume form Σ such that its β-diffeomorphism $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \Sigma$ reduces to a total divergence. However, it is in general impossible to find such Σ, because $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \Sigma$ is not necessarily d-exact. Explicitly, we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \Sigma = -\frac{1}{\rho}\partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij})\zeta_j \Sigma + \theta^{ij}\partial_i \zeta_j \Sigma, \tag{3.44}$$

and we immediately recognize that the relative sign prevents the right-hand side from being a total divergence.

It is known that the modular class of a Poisson manifold M is an obstruction to the existence of a volume form on M, which is invariant under the action of Hamiltonian vector fields [29], see also [30] and references therein. Since a Hamiltonian vector field $X_f = -d_\theta f$ is a particular case of the β-diffeomorphism, it is natural to expect that there is a desired volume form when the modular class is trivial. We show that this is indeed the case.

Modular class Given a volume form Σ as (3.40), by applying the formula (3.41) to a Hamiltonian vector field $X_f = -d_\theta f = \theta(df)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\Sigma = X_\Sigma(f)\Sigma, \quad X_\Sigma(f) = -\frac{1}{\rho}\partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij})\partial_j f. \tag{3.45}$$

Since f is arbitrary, it is shown that X_Σ defines a vector field, called the modular vector field, locally represented as

$$X_\Sigma = -\frac{1}{\rho}\partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij})\partial_j. \tag{3.46}$$

Let Σ_1 be another volume form. Then, since it can be written as $\Sigma_1 = e^\chi\Sigma$ for some function χ, the corresponding modular vector field X_{Σ_1} is given by

$$X_{\Sigma_1} = X_\Sigma + d_\theta\chi. \tag{3.47}$$

It is also shown that $d_\theta X_\Sigma = 0$. Therefore, its cohomology class $[X_\Sigma] \in H^1_\theta(M)$, called the modular class, in the first Poisson cohomology is independent of the volume form [29].
Proof. The left hand side of the equation $\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\Sigma_1 = X_{\Sigma_1}(f)\Sigma_1$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\Sigma_1 &= \mathcal{L}_{X_f}(e^\chi\Sigma) = (\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\chi)e^\chi\Sigma + e^\chi(\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\Sigma)\\ &= \theta(df, d\chi)\Sigma_1 + X_\Sigma(f)\Sigma_1 = \left(X_\Sigma(f) - \theta(d\chi, df)\right)\Sigma_1\\ &= \left(X_\Sigma + d_\theta\chi\right)(f)\Sigma_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

This shows the first assertion (3.47). Next, the equation

$$\begin{aligned}X_\Sigma(\{f,g\})\Sigma &= \mathcal{L}_{X_{\{f,g\}}}\Sigma = [\mathcal{L}_{X_f}, \mathcal{L}_{X_g}]\Sigma\\ &= \mathcal{L}_{X_f}X_\Sigma(g)\Sigma - \mathcal{L}_{X_g}X_\Sigma(f)\Sigma\\ &= \left(X_f(X_\Sigma(g)) - X_g(X_\Sigma(f))\right)\Sigma\\ &= \left(\{f, X_\Sigma(g)\} + \{X_\Sigma(f), g\}\right)\Sigma, \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

implies that the vector field X_Σ generates an infinitesimal flow preserving the Poisson bracket. It means that $0 = \mathcal{L}_{X_\Sigma}\theta = d_\theta X_\Sigma$. *q.e.d.*

Note that the equation (3.44) is rewritten by using the modular vector field as

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\Sigma = \left(i_\zeta X_\Sigma + \theta^{ij}\partial_i\zeta_j\right)\Sigma. \tag{3.50}$$

Unimodular case In general, a Poisson manifold M is called unimodular[20], if its modular class vanishes, $[X_\Sigma] = 0$. In this case, a modular vector field is always d_θ-exact, that is, $X_\Sigma = d_\theta\phi$ for some function ϕ on M:

$$X_\Sigma = -\frac{1}{\rho}\partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij})\partial_j = -\theta^{ij}\partial_i\phi\partial_j. \tag{3.51}$$

Let $\Sigma_1 = e^{-\phi}\Sigma$ be another volume form induced from Σ. Then, according to (3.47), the corresponding modular vector field vanishes: $X_{\Sigma_1} = X_\Sigma - d_\theta\phi = 0$. Hence, Σ_1 is invariant $\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\Sigma_1 = 0$ for any Hamilton vector field X_f.

---

[20] It is different from the unimodular condition $\sqrt{-g} = 1$ used in the unimodular gravity.

Moreover, we observe that the same volume form Σ_1 transforms as a total divergence under a β-diffeomorphism. Indeed, by applying (3.50) for Σ_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta(\Sigma_1) &= \theta^{ij}\partial_i\zeta_j\Sigma_1 \\ &= \partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij}e^{-\phi}\zeta_j)dx^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dx^n,\end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

where we used

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij}e^{-\phi}\zeta_j) &= \partial_i(\rho\theta^{ij})e^{-\phi}\zeta_j - \rho\theta^{ij}\partial_i\phi e^{-\phi}\zeta_j + \rho\theta^{ij}e^{-\phi}\partial_i\zeta_j \\ &= \rho\theta^{ij}e^{-\phi}\partial_i\zeta_j,\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

following from (3.51). Hence, the integral defined by the measure Σ_1 is invariant under β-diffeomorphisms.

Since in our case, a unimodular Poisson manifold M is also a Riemannian manifold equipped with a metric G, we choose the Riemannian volume form $\rho = \sqrt{\det G}$ in Σ. Then, our invariant measure is

$$\Sigma_1 = e^{-\phi}\sqrt{\det G}dx^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dx^n. \tag{3.54}$$

The integration of any scalar function f with this measure is invariant under both diffeomorphism and β-diffeomorphism. This factor $e^{-\phi}$ is a reminiscent of the dilaton field. However, it should be determined by the partial differential equation

$$\theta^{ij}\partial_i\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det G}}\partial_i(\sqrt{\det G}\theta^{ij}), \tag{3.55}$$

which follows from (3.51). The existence of the solution is guaranteed by the unimodularity.

As a special case, we consider a symplectic manifold, which is a unimodular Poisson manifold. In this case, (3.55) reduces to

$$\partial_k\phi = -G_{ij}\partial_k G^{ij} + \theta^{-1}_{jk}\partial_i\theta^{ij}. \tag{3.56}$$

For the case of a Kähler manifold in particular, it would be an interesting question how this scalar field ϕ controls the balance of the metric and the symplectic form. In [19–21], it is also shown that a Riemann-Poisson manifold is unimodular.

3.6 Einstein-Hilbert-like action and others

Since we have obtained both the generalized contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{\Omega}$ (3.38) and the invariant measure Σ_1 (3.54), an Einstein-Hilbert-like action can be written as

$$S[G,\beta] = \int d^nxe^{-\phi}\sqrt{\det G_{ij}}\left(\bar{R} - \frac{1}{4}R^2\right), \tag{3.57}$$

where $\bar{R}$ is the contravariant Ricci scalar and R is the R-flux obtained in the preceding subsections. As argued previously, this action is invariant under β-diffeomorphisms. Moreover, it is also invariant under β-gauge transformations. This is because a β-gauge transformation can only affect an R-flux, but it keeps R invariant, as mentioned below (3.9). Thus we have obtained a kind of gravity theory that consistently couples with an R-flux. By construction, the dynamical variables of this theory are the metric G and the local bivectors β_α.

As in the case of ordinary gravity, this choice of action is just the simplest one. More generally, any scalar (other than $\bar{\Omega}$) is allowed to be utilized in the construction of an action. Since there is the Poisson tensor θ^{ij} in addition to the metric G_{ij}, the number of possibilities to make scalar quantities is much greater than that in the usual gravity theory. Furthermore, if the inverse of the Poisson tensor exists, the degrees of freedom of making a scalar increase tremendously. For example, multiplying θ^{-1} twice on the contravariant Riemann tensor $\bar{R}_l^{kij}$ (2.52) yields the ordinary Riemannian tensor R^k_{lab} (plus other terms made of the contravariant contorsion):

$$\begin{aligned} & -\theta^{-1}_{ai}\theta^{-1}_{bj}\bar{R}_l^{kij} \\ =& \mathsf{R}^k_{lab} + (\nabla_n\theta^{-1}_{ab})K_l^{nk} + \theta^{-1}_{ai}\nabla_b K_l^{ik} - \theta^{-1}_{bj}\nabla_a K_l^{jk} - \theta^{-1}_{ai}\theta^{-1}_{bj}K_m^{jk}K_l^{im} + \theta^{-1}_{ai}\theta^{-1}_{bj}K_m^{ik}K_l^{jm}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.58}$$

This tensor can also be used to construct the action, which might be interpreted as a deformation of the ordinary gravity theories including the ordinary Einstein-Hilbert action. Of course, which action it favors depends on the situation. This will be clarified by studying classical solutions of the theory and their geometry, or relations to other theories such as string theory.

4 Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we studied the Riemannian geometry on a Poisson manifold, first in the framework of a geometry based on the Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ of a Poisson manifold and then in the framework of the Poisson Generalized Geometry based on the Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$. We found the consistent definitions of the contravariant versions of the connection, torsion and the curvature tensors in both frameworks and established the relationship between them. It is worth noting that the R-flux appeared as a contravariant torsion tensor. Then we showed that gravity theories coupled with R-fluxes can be constructed. In particular, using the contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{\Omega}$, which is a sum of the contravariant Ricci scalar $\bar{R}$ and the square of the R-flux as

$$\bar{\Omega} = \bar{R} - \frac{1}{4}R^2, \tag{4.1}$$

together with the invariant measure on unimodular Poisson manifolds, we constructed the Einstein-Hilbert-like action

$$S[G,\beta] = \int d^n x e^{-\phi}\sqrt{\det G}\left(\bar{R} - \frac{1}{4}R^2\right), \tag{4.2}$$

which is invariant under both β-gauge transformations and β-diffeomorphisms.

Comparison with ordinary gravity The structure of the results obtained above is the same by construction as those in the case of the standard Generalized Geometry. There, the H-flux appears as a torsion tensor and the generalized Ricci scalar is a sum of the ordinary Ricci scalar R and the square of the H-fluxes:

$$\Omega = \mathsf{R} - \frac{1}{4}H^2, \tag{4.3}$$

where the Ricci scalar R is the one constructed from the Riemannian metric g_{ij} and $H^2 = g^{il}g^{jm}g^{kn}H_{ijk}H_{lmn}$ (see Appendix A). The resulting action is that of the NSNS sector of the supergravity theory[21]

$$S_{\mathrm{NSNS}}[g,B] = \int dx^n \sqrt{\det g_{ij}}\left(\mathsf{R} - \frac{1}{4}H^2\right), \tag{4.4}$$

which is invariant under both B-gauge transformations and diffeomorphisms.

Although these two theories, $S[G,\beta]$ and $S_{\mathrm{NSNS}}[g,B]$, are similar in their structures, they are definitely different in many ways. The differences stem from the difference between two Lie algebroids $(T^*M)_\theta$ and TM, and the two different Courant algebroids $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ and $TM \oplus T^*M$. In particular, R-fluxes and H-fluxes are generically independent notions. The difference becomes more apparent if we switch the description of an R-flux via the R-twisted bracket to the description via the R-twisted Courant algebroid E (see (3.10)). An H-flux also has such a description by an H-twisted Courant algebroid E'. These two algebroids E and E' are different as vector bundles, since E is glued by local β-gauge transformations, while E' is glued by local B-gauge transformations. Thus there is in general no way to relate both of them, except for imposing a particular constraint on the geometry on M.

Nevertheless, it is meaningful to compare the two theories, when we focus on the gravitational part only. This makes sense because the metric structure is independent of whether the fluxes are present or not, as explained in the beginning of section 3.2. In particular, we shall assume that the Courant algebroid is twisted by a trivial element of the Poisson cohomology, or equivalently, the R-twisted bracket is given by $R = d_\theta\beta$ with a global bivector β. Then, we can come back to the bundle (3.12) parametrized by $G + \beta$. Similarly, if the H-flux is trivial in a sense similarly as discussed above, C_+ is given by a graph associated with a map $g + B : TM \to T^*M$,

$$C_+ = \{X + (g+B)(X) \mid X \in TM\}, \tag{4.5}$$

where B is a global 2-form.

Now we recall the argument in [1]. Since the definition of the subbundle C_+ depends only on the bundle and the bilinear form, a generalized Riemannian structure of the Courant algebroid $(TM)_0 \oplus (T^*M)_\theta$ is equivalent to that of the standard Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$. In other words, these two Courant algebroids share the same generalized Riemannian structure C_+. The two representations (3.12) and (4.5) of C_+ are related by

$$G + \beta = (g+B)^{-1}. \tag{4.6}$$

---

[21] We ignore the dilaton term.

Thus, it is possible to compare the two theories $S[G,\beta]$ and $S_{\text{NSNS}}[g,B]$ through this relation. Note, however, that the Poisson tensor θ does not appear in this relation[22]. One possibility is to treat the Poisson tensor as a matter field as in the argument in §2.4.

Future directions To understand the dynamics of the theory, we need to investigate the equations of motion, and to analyze their classical solutions. Solutions of particular interest are the analogue of the fundamental string solution and the NS5-brane solution that should be charged under the R-flux, since such objects are speculated to exhibit exotic geometrical properties [33–43]. An open question is whether our framework provides a geometrical meaning for those non-geometric objects.

It is also interesting to study the concept of T-duality within this theory, together with the Kalza-Klein reduction. As shown in [2], at the topological level, the Q-fluxes appear in PGG when the spacetime M is non-trivially fibered by S^1. At the level of the Riemannian geometry, this information should be included in the contravariant scalar curvature term in the action.

There is another open question about the status of the Poisson structure. By construction, in this paper we assume that the Poisson structure is given before a Riemannian metric is defined. The resulting equation of motion of the gravity theory determines the metric for a fixed Poisson structure, rather than being determined simultaneously. Note that our setting is close to the concept of the non-commutative geometry. In general, a Poisson manifold can be regarded as the semi-classical approximation of a non-commutative space, that is, a Poisson tensor is a part of the characterization of a space. Hence, by applying Kontsevich's deformation quantization [44,45], it is natural to expect that the gravity theory in this paper might be lifted to a gravity theory on a non-commutative space. In this sense, it is interesting to compare our theory with the work of [46], or with the emergent gravity approach in matrix models [47–49].

Comparison with other approaches We give a few comments on the relationships to other approaches to gravity theory with non-geometric fluxes.

The approach [9] is conceptually similar to the content of §2 of this paper. The authors consider a quasi-Poisson version of our Lie algebroid $(T^*M)_\theta$ and regard their R-flux as the violation of the Poisson condition due to the quasi-Poisson structure. Based on these notions of geometry, they construct the contravariant Levi-Civita connection and obtain an action, which is invariant under their β-diffeomorphisms. Their action is equivalent to (4.4) by a field redefinition $G+\beta$ to $g+B$, for the symplectic case. In particular, eq. (4.23) of [9] is formally the same as ours (2.17), if we identify their β as our θ.

The series of papers by Andriot et.al. [10,43,50–55] is conceptually very different from ours, because their formalism is based on the double field theory (DFT) approach (see [56–60] for DFT.). They consider differential geometry on the doubled space and construct a connection. The resulting theory is a sum of the ordinary and the dual Ricci scalar plus non-geometric flux terms, which is manifestly invariant under the ordinary diffeomorphism. By dropping the dependence on the dual coordinates, their outcome is also equivalent to (4.4) [10]. In this approach, there are also similar formulae to ours. In particular, eq. (24) in [51] is formally the same as our (2.17), our relations (2.46) and (2.47) are given in (1.26) of [10] and it is also suggested that our (2.48) corresponds to (3.13) of [10][23], if we again identify their β as our θ.

---

[22] Note that there is also another relation of two Riemannian metrics G and g including the Poisson tensor θ [31,32], appears in a different situation, where both descriptions are in the the same Courant algebroid $TM\oplus T^*M$.

However, there are significant differences between the work mentioned above and our construction that can be summarized as follows: In both approaches, [9] and [10, 43, 50–54] our Poisson tensor θ is replaced by a (not necessary Poisson) bivector β. This causes a breakdown of the Lie algebroid structure of $(T^*M)_\theta$. As a result, they need to introduce a rather complicated definition of β-diffeomorphism and the notion of β-tensors. We expect that our construction in this paper should have clarified this point and achieved an improvement in geometrical understanding.

Furthermore, it should be noted that their definitions of Q- and R-fluxes, are different from ours. In both approaches, a bivector β plays the role of a source of such fluxes. For example, they are defined in [51] as

$$R^{ijk} = 3(\tilde{\partial}^{[i}\beta^{jk]} + \beta^{l[i}\partial_l\beta^{jk]}), \quad Q_k{}^{ij} = \partial_k\beta^{ij}, \tag{4.7}$$

and by dropping the dual derivative, they are equivalent to those in [9]. R^{ijk} appears in the commutator of the connection, and $Q_k{}^{ij}$ appears in the skew-symmetric part of the connection[24]. This suggests again that their fluxes correspond to the gravitational part of our theory (§2 in this paper), by the replacement of our θ with their β. If $\beta = \theta$ is Poisson, then $R^{ijk} = 0$, which is guaranteed by the Poisson condition $[\theta, \theta]_S = 0$, and the $Q_k{}^{ij}$ above is nothing but the skew-symmetric part of our contravariant Levi-Civita connection. As a result, it is not clear whether an R-flux in their definition is a gauge field strength like an H-flux, and it is not explained why the combination of the Ricci scalar and the R-square term appears.

On the other hand, in our approach, the roles of the Poisson tensor θ and the bivector potential β are independent of each other, and the R-flux is treated in the same way as an H-flux. That is, our R-flux is independent of the gravity part (i.e. the contravariant Levi-Civita connection), but is combined with the gravity as a torsion when considering a connection on C_+. This explains the combination above as a generalized Ricci scalar, although the physical meaning of θ is still unclear. In our approach, a Q-flux appears also in the different places: it is associated with the Kaluza-Klein reduction of a metric [2].

Another but the most important difference lies in the point where they consider that the theories should be equivalent to the ordinary gravity theory with an H-flux, whereas we do not assume such an equivalence. However, rather than focusing on such differences, in our opinion, it would be better to pursue the study of their similarities more concretely. For example, the formal coincidence to the formula (24) in [51], mentioned above, suggests that our contravariant Levi-Civita connection can be lifted to the DFT framework. Then, it is interesting to see how our R-flux is lifted under such a scenario. After lifting to the DFT framework, it would be possible to compare these approaches with ours in more detail.

---

[23] These points are clarified in communication with David Andriot.

[24] In [43, 51], a differnt definition of a Q-flux is given, in terms of flat indices.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to thank the members of the particle theory and cosmology group, in particular U. Carow-Watamura for helpful comments and discussions. They would also like to thank David Andriot for valuable comments and suggestions. H. M. is supported in part by the Tohoku University Institute for International Advanced Research and Education.

A Riemannian geometry based on Generalized Geometry

Here we review on the Riemannian geometry in the framework of the standard generalized geometry, based on the Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$. For more details, see [14].

A.1 Courant algebroid $TM \oplus T^*M$

The Courant bracket in the standard generalized geometry is defined by

$$[X+\xi, Y+\eta] = [X,Y] + \mathcal{L}_X\eta - \mathcal{L}_Y\xi - \frac{1}{2}d(i_X\eta - i_Y\xi), \tag{A.1}$$

where $X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$ and $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma(T^*M)$. For $u = X+\xi$, $v = Y+\eta$ and a 2-form B, it is shown that

$$[e^B(u), e^B(v)] = [u + B(X), v + B(Y)] = e^B([u,v]) + i_Y i_X dB. \tag{A.2}$$

Thus the bracket is invariant under the B-transformation e^B with a closed 2-form, $dB = 0$. In general, in the case of $dB \neq 0$, it acts as a shift $H \to H + dB$ in the H-twisted bracket

$$[u,v]_H = [u,v] + i_Y i_X H. \tag{A.3}$$

The Courant bracket satisfies following relations,

$$[u, fv] = f[u,v] + (\mathcal{L}_X f)v - df\langle u,v\rangle, \tag{A.4}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_X\langle v,w\rangle = \langle [u,v] + d\langle u,v\rangle, w\rangle + \langle v, [u,w] + d\langle u,w\rangle\rangle, \tag{A.5}$$

for $u = X+\xi$, $v = Y+\eta$ and $w = Z+\zeta$, which are the analogues of (3.7) and (3.8).

A.2 Generalized Riemannian geometry

Let C_+ be a generalized Riemannian structure of $TM \oplus T^*M$, written as a graph $C_+ = \{X + g(X) | X \in TM\}$, where g is a Riemannian metric. A generalized connection, which is a connection $D : \Gamma(C_+) \to \Gamma(T^*M \otimes C_+)$ on the vector bundle C_+, is obtained by setting

$$D_X u := \pi_+([X^-, u]_H), \tag{A.6}$$

for any $X \in \Gamma(TM)$ and $u = Y^+ \in \Gamma(C_+)$. Here we introduced lifts $^\pm$ as $X^\pm = X \pm g(X) \in \Gamma(C_\pm)$, The notations are slightly changed from [14]. It satisfies the axioms of the connection, and preserves the $O(d,d)$-inner product.

The generalized torsion τ and the curvature Ω of D are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau(X,Y) = D_X Y^+ - D_Y X^+ - ([X,Y])^+, \\ &\Omega(X,Y)u = (D_X D_Y - D_Y D_X - D_{[X,Y]})u. \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

They are tensors of $\Gamma(\wedge^2 T^*M \otimes C_+)$ and $\Gamma(\wedge^2 T^*M \otimes \mathrm{End}(C_+))$, respectively.

In local coordinates $\{x^i\}$ with the basis $(\partial_j)^+$ of C_+, the connection coefficient reads

$$D_{\partial_i}(\partial_j)^+ = \Upsilon^m_{ij}(\partial_m)^+, \quad \Upsilon^m_{ij} = \Gamma^m_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} g^{mk} H_{kij}, \tag{A.8}$$

where Γ^m_{ij} is the Christoffel symbol of the Levi-Civita connection, that is constructed from the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. It shows that the generalized connection D on C_+ is the lift of an affine connection on TM, such that an H-flux appears as a deviation from the Levi-Civita connection.

The H-flux arises as the torsion tensor, as seen from the components of the torsion tensor,

$$\tau^m_{ij} = \Upsilon^m_{ij} - \Upsilon^m_{ji} = g^{mk} H_{kij}. \tag{A.9}$$

The components of the generalized curvature

$$\Omega^m_{kij} = \partial_i \Upsilon^m_{jk} - \partial_j \Upsilon^m_{ik} + \Upsilon^l_{jk}\Upsilon^m_{il} - \Upsilon^l_{ik}\Upsilon^m_{jl}, \tag{A.10}$$

is written by using (A.8) as

$$\Omega^m_{kij} = \mathsf{R}^m_{kij} + \frac{1}{4} g^{ln} H_{njk} g^{mp} H_{pil} - \frac{1}{4} g^{ln} H_{nik} g^{mp} H_{pjl} + \frac{1}{2} g^{ml} \nabla_i H_{ljk} - \frac{1}{2} g^{ml} \nabla_j H_{lik}, \tag{A.11}$$

where R^m_{kij} is the Riemann curvature tensor

$$\mathsf{R}^m_{kij} = \partial_i \Gamma^m_{jk} - \partial_j \Gamma^m_{ik} + \Gamma^l_{jk}\Gamma^m_{il} - \Gamma^l_{ik}\Gamma^m_{jl}. \tag{A.12}$$

Then, the generalized Ricci tensor is obtained by taking a contraction:

$$\Omega_{kj} := \Omega^m_{kmj} = \mathsf{R}_{kj} - \frac{1}{4} g^{ln} H_{nmk} g^{mp} H_{pjl} + \frac{1}{2} g^{ml} \nabla_m H_{ljk}, \tag{A.13}$$

with the Ricci tensor R_{kj}, and the generalized Ricci scalar is given by

$$\Omega := g^{kj}\Omega_{kj} = \mathsf{R} - \frac{1}{4} g^{il} g^{jm} g^{kn} H_{ijk} H_{lmn}, \tag{A.14}$$

where R is the usual Ricci scalar constructed by the Riemann metric g. This form (A.14) of the generalized Ricci scalar appears in the action of the NS-NS sector of the supergravity.

B Computational details

Proofs of metricity (2.12) **and torsion-less condition** (2.13)

- Proof of (2.12): By the Koszul formula, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2G(\nabla_\xi\eta,\zeta)+2G(\eta,\nabla_\xi\zeta)\\
=&\theta(\xi)\cdot G(\eta,\zeta)+\theta(\eta)\cdot G(\xi,\zeta)-\theta(\zeta)\cdot G(\xi,\eta)+\theta(\xi)\cdot G(\zeta,\eta)+\theta(\zeta)\cdot G(\xi,\eta)-\theta(\eta)\cdot G(\xi,\zeta)\\
&\quad+G([\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta)+G([\zeta,\eta]_\theta,\xi)+G([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta)+G([\eta,\xi]_\theta,\zeta)+G([\eta,\zeta]_\theta,\xi)+G([\xi,\zeta]_\theta,\eta)\\
=&2\theta(\xi)\cdot G(\eta,\zeta)\\
=&2\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi G(\eta,\zeta),
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.1}
$$

  which says that ∇ is metric-compatible.

- Proof of (2.13): By using the Koszul formula again, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2G(\bar T(\xi,\eta),\zeta)\\
=&2G(\nabla_\xi\eta,\zeta)-2G(\nabla_\eta\xi,\zeta)-2G([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta)\\
=&\theta(\xi)\cdot G(\eta,\zeta)+\theta(\eta)\cdot G(\xi,\zeta)-\theta(\zeta)\cdot G(\xi,\eta)-\theta(\eta)\cdot G(\xi,\zeta)-\theta(\xi)\cdot G(\eta,\zeta)+\theta(\zeta)\cdot G(\eta,\xi)\\
&\quad+G([\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta)+G([\zeta,\eta]_\theta,\xi)+G([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta)-G([\zeta,\eta]_\theta,\xi)-G([\zeta,\xi]_\theta,\eta)-G([\eta,\xi]_\theta,\zeta)\\
&\quad-2G([\xi,\eta]_\theta,\zeta)\\
=&0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.2}
$$

  for arbitrary ξ, η and ζ, which shows that $\bar T=0$.

Proofs of the Bianchi intensities (2.23) **and** (2.24) For the curvature for a contravariant affine connection $\bar\nabla$, together with the torsion tensor, we have the Bianchi identities:

- First Bianchi identity (2.23): Since $\bar T(\xi,\eta)=\bar\nabla_\xi\eta-\bar\nabla_\eta\xi-[\xi,\eta]_\theta$[25], we have

$$\bar\nabla_\zeta[\bar T(\xi,\eta)]=\bar\nabla_\zeta\bar\nabla_\xi\eta-\bar\nabla_\zeta\bar\nabla_\eta\xi-(\bar T(\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta)+\bar\nabla_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta}\zeta+[\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta]_\theta). \tag{B.3}$$

  Then we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\bar\nabla_\zeta[\bar T(\xi,\eta)]+\bar\nabla_\xi[\bar T(\eta,\zeta)]+\bar\nabla_\eta[\bar T(\zeta,\xi)]\\
&\quad=\bar R(\zeta,\xi)\eta+\bar R(\xi,\eta)\zeta+\bar R(\eta,\zeta)\xi-(\bar T(\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta)+\bar T(\xi,[\eta,\zeta]_\theta)+\bar T(\eta,[\zeta,\xi]_\theta)),
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.4}
$$

  where we used the Jacobi identity $[\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta]_\theta+[\xi,[\eta,\zeta]_\theta]_\theta+[\eta,[\zeta,\xi]_\theta]_\theta=0$. On the other hand, since $\bar T$ is tensorial, we also have

$$\bar\nabla_\zeta[\bar T(\xi,\eta)]=\bar\nabla_\zeta\bar T(\xi,\eta)+\bar T(\bar\nabla_\zeta\xi,\eta)+\bar T(\xi,\bar\nabla_\zeta\eta). \tag{B.5}$$

---

[25] In the case where $\bar\nabla$ is the contravariant Levi-Civita, the torsion tensor vanishes, $\bar T=0$.

Then we find the first Bianchi identity

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{R}(\zeta,\xi)\eta+\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\zeta+\bar{R}(\eta,\zeta)\xi\\&=\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\bar{T}(\xi,\eta)+\bar{\nabla}_\xi\bar{T}(\eta,\zeta)+\bar{\nabla}_\eta\bar{T}(\zeta,\xi)+\bar{T}(\bar{T}(\xi,\eta),\zeta)+\bar{T}(\bar{T}(\eta,\zeta),\xi)+\bar{T}(\bar{T}(\zeta,\xi),\eta).\end{aligned}\tag{B.6}$$

- Second Bianchi identity (2.24): Noting

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\nabla}_\zeta[\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\omega]&=\bar{\nabla}_\zeta(\bar{R}(\xi,\eta))\omega+\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\omega\\&=(\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\bar{\nabla}_\xi\bar{\nabla}_\eta-\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\bar{\nabla}_\eta\bar{\nabla}_\xi-\bar{R}(\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta)-\bar{\nabla}_{[\xi,\eta]_\theta}\bar{\nabla}_\zeta-\bar{\nabla}_{[\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta]_\theta})\omega,\end{aligned}\tag{B.7}$$

we obtain, with the use of the Jacobi identity,

$$[\bar{\nabla}_\zeta(\bar{R}(\xi,\eta))+\bar{\nabla}_\xi(\bar{R}(\eta,\zeta))+\bar{\nabla}_\eta(\bar{R}(\zeta,\xi))]\omega=-[\bar{R}(\zeta,[\xi,\eta]_\theta)+\bar{R}(\xi,[\eta,\zeta]_\theta)+\bar{R}(\eta,[\zeta,\xi]_\theta)]\omega.\tag{B.8}$$

Noticing that $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta(\bar{R}(\xi,\eta))\omega=\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)\omega+\bar{R}(\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\xi,\eta)\omega+\bar{R}(\xi,\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\eta)\omega$, as $\bar{R}$ is tensorial, we find the second Bianchi identity

$$(\bar{\nabla}_\zeta\bar{R}(\xi,\eta)+\bar{\nabla}_\xi\bar{R}(\eta,\zeta)+\bar{\nabla}_\eta\bar{R}(\zeta,\xi))\omega=(\bar{R}(\zeta,\bar{T}(\xi,\eta))+\bar{R}(\xi,\bar{T}(\eta,\zeta))+\bar{R}(\eta,\bar{T}(\zeta,\xi)))\omega.\tag{B.9}$$

Transformation law for $\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_k$ (2.38) The contravariant derivative of a 1-form is given by

$$\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j=\partial^i\eta_j+\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j\eta_k.\tag{B.10}$$

By a β-diffeomorphism, we have

$$\bar{\nabla}'^{\,i}\eta'_j=\partial^i\eta'_j+\bar{\Gamma}'^{ik}_j\eta'_k.\tag{B.11}$$

where $\eta'_j=\eta_j+\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\eta_j$. If we write $\bar{\Gamma}'^{ik}_j=\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j+\delta_\zeta\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j$, then it reduces (at the linear order in ζ)

$$\bar{\nabla}'^{\,i}\eta'_j=\bar{\nabla}^i(\eta_j+\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\eta_j)+\delta_\zeta\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j\eta_k.\tag{B.12}$$

On the other hand, we demand that it transforms as a $(1,1)$-tensor. That is,

$$\bar{\nabla}'^{\,i}\eta'_j=\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j+\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta(\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j).\tag{B.13}$$

Then, $\delta_\zeta\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j$ should be determined by

$$\delta_\zeta\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j\eta_k=\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta(\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j)-\bar{\nabla}^i(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta\eta_j).\tag{B.14}$$

We now compute the right hand side.

From the transformation law of a $(1,1)$-tensor,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta(\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j)&=\zeta_k\partial^k(\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_j)+M^k_j(\bar{\nabla}^i\eta_k)-M^i_k(\bar{\nabla}^k\eta_j)\\&=\zeta_k\partial^k(\partial^i\eta_j+\bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j\eta_l)+M^k_j(\partial^i\eta_k+\bar{\Gamma}^{il}_k\eta_l)-M^i_k(\partial^k\eta_j+\bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j\eta_l)\\&=\zeta_k\partial^k\partial^i\eta_j+\zeta_k(\partial^k\bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j\eta_l+\bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j\partial^k\eta_l)+M^k_j(\partial^i\eta_k+\bar{\Gamma}^{il}_k\eta_l)-M^i_k(\partial^k\eta_j+\bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j\eta_l)\end{aligned}\tag{B.15}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\nabla}^i(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \eta_j) &= \partial^i(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \eta_j) + \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta \eta_k) \\ &= \partial^i(\zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j + \eta_k M^k_j) + \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j(\zeta_l \partial^l \eta_k + \eta_l M^l_k) \\ &= \partial^i \zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j + \zeta_k \partial^i \partial^k \eta_j + \partial^i \eta_k M^k_j + \eta_k \partial^i M^k_j + \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j(\zeta_l \partial^l \eta_k + \eta_l M^l_k) \end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

From these expressions, (B.14) is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\zeta \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j \eta_k = &\zeta_k(\partial^k \partial^i - \partial^i \partial^k)\eta_j - \partial^i \zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j - M^i_k \partial^k \eta_j \\ &+ \left(\zeta_k \partial^k \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j + M^k_j \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_k - M^i_k \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j - m^l_k \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j - \partial^i M^l_j\right) \eta_l, \end{aligned} \tag{B.17}$$

but the first line vanishes (see below) and we finally obtain

$$\delta_\zeta \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j = \zeta_k \partial^k \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_j + M^k_j \bar{\Gamma}^{il}_k - M^i_k \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_j - M^l_k \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_j - \partial^i M^l_j. \tag{B.18}$$

We show that the first line in (B.17) vanishes. By using $M^i_k = -(\partial^i \zeta_k + \partial_k \theta^{il} \zeta_l)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\zeta_k(\partial^k \partial^i - \partial^i \partial^k)\eta_j - \partial^i \zeta_k \partial^k \eta_j - M^i_k \partial^k \eta_j \\ =&\zeta_l \left((\partial^l \partial^i - \partial^i \partial^l)\eta_j + \partial_k \theta^{il} \partial^k \eta_j\right). \end{aligned} \tag{B.19}$$

By noting that

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial^l \partial^i - \partial^i \partial^l)\eta_j &= \theta^{ln}\partial_n(\theta^{im}\partial_m \eta_j) - \theta^{im}\partial_m(\theta^{ln}\partial_n \eta_j) \\ &= \theta^{ln}\partial_n \theta^{im}\partial_m \eta_j - \theta^{im}\partial_m \theta^{ln}\partial_n \eta_j \\ &= (\theta^{ln}\partial_n \theta^{im} - \theta^{in}\partial_n \theta^{lm})\partial_m \eta_j, \end{aligned} \tag{B.20}$$

we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_l \left((\partial^l \partial^i - \partial^i \partial^l)\eta_j + \partial_k \theta^{il} \partial^k \eta_j\right) =&\zeta_l(\theta^{ln}\partial_n \theta^{im} - \theta^{in}\partial_n \theta^{lm} + \partial_n \theta^{il}\theta^{nm})\partial_m \eta_j \\ =&\zeta_l(\theta^{ln}\partial_n \theta^{im} + \theta^{in}\partial_n \theta^{ml} + \theta^{mn}\partial_n \theta^{li})\partial_m \eta_j \\ =&0, \end{aligned} \tag{B.21}$$

due to the Poisson condition.

Contravariant derivative of a tensor field (2.37) To show that claim, $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s}$ transforms as a (r, s)-tensor again, define the difference as $\mathcal{A}_\zeta = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta - \bar{\nabla}_\zeta$, where $\bar{\nabla}_\zeta$ is a affine contravariant derivative. Then, by using and (2.33) and (2.37), we have on an (r, s)-tensor T,

$$(\mathcal{A}_\zeta T)^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \left(-M^{i_p}_l + \bar{\Gamma}^{k i_p}_l \zeta_k\right) T^{i_1 \cdots l \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots j_s} - \sum_{q=1}^{s} \left(-M^l_{j_q} + \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_{j_q} \zeta_k\right) T^{i_1 \cdots i_r}_{j_1 \cdots l \cdots j_s}. \tag{B.22}$$

By using (2.35) $\bar{\nabla}^l \zeta_{j_q} = \partial^l \zeta_{j_q} + \bar{\Gamma}^{lk}_{j_q} \zeta_k$, the term inside the bracket becomes

$$\begin{aligned}-M^l_{j_q} + \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_{j_q} \zeta_k &= \partial^l \zeta_{j_q} + \partial_{j_q} \theta^{lk} \zeta_k + \bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_{j_q} \zeta_k \\ &= \bar{\nabla}^l \zeta_{j_q} + \partial_{j_q} \theta^{lk} \zeta_k + \left(\bar{\Gamma}^{kl}_{j_q} - \bar{\Gamma}^{lk}_{j_q}\right) \zeta_k \\ &= \bar{\nabla}^l \zeta_{j_q} - T^{kl}_{j_q} \zeta_k. \end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

Therefore, we can simplify the result as

$$(\mathcal{A}_\zeta T)^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s} = \sum_{p=1}^{r}(\bar{\nabla}^{i_p}\zeta_l - T^{ki_p}_{l}\zeta_k)T^{i_1\cdots l\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots j_s} - \sum_{q=1}^{s}(\bar{\nabla}^{l}\zeta_{j_q} - T^{kl}_{j_q}\zeta_k)T^{i_1\cdots i_r}_{j_1\cdots l\cdots j_s}. \tag{B.24}$$

Since $\bar{\nabla}^l\zeta_j$ or equivalently $\bar{\nabla}_\xi\zeta$ is a tensor, this expression is a combination of tensor fields only. Thus, the claim is shown.

Proof of (2.52) By using (2.46), we compute preliminarily

$$\theta^{im}\partial_m\bar{\Gamma}^{jk}_{l} = \theta^{im}(\partial_m\Gamma^k_{nl}\theta^{nj} + \Gamma^k_{nl}\partial_m\theta^{nj} + \partial_m K^{jk}_{l}), \tag{B.25}$$

$$(\partial_n\theta^{ij})\bar{\Gamma}^{nk}_{l} = (\partial_n\theta^{ij})(\Gamma^k_{pl}\theta^{pn} + K^{nk}_{l}), \tag{B.26}$$

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{jk}_{m}\bar{\Gamma}^{im}_{l} = (\Gamma^k_{nm}\theta^{nj} + K^{jk}_{m})(\Gamma^m_{pl}\theta^{pi} + K^{im}_{l}). \tag{B.27}$$

Gathering these stuff, we find that the contravariant Riemann tensor in (2.25) results in

$$\bar{R}^{kij}_{l} = \theta^{im}(\partial_m\Gamma^k_{nl})\theta^{nj} - \theta^{jm}(\partial_m\Gamma^k_{nl})\theta^{ni} + \Gamma^k_{nm}\theta^{nj}\Gamma^m_{pl}\theta^{pi} - \Gamma^k_{nm}\theta^{ni}\Gamma^m_{pl}\theta^{pj} \tag{B.28}$$

$$+ \theta^{im}\partial_m K^{jk}_{l} - \theta^{jm}\partial_m K^{ik}_{l} + \Gamma^k_{nm}\theta^{nj}K^{im}_{l} - K^{ik}_{m}\Gamma^m_{pl}\theta^{pj} + K^{jk}_{m}\Gamma^m_{pl}\theta^{pi} - \Gamma^k_{nm}\theta^{ni}K^{jm}_{l} \tag{B.29}$$

$$+ \theta^{im}\Gamma^k_{nl}\partial_m\theta^{nj} - \theta^{jm}\Gamma^k_{nl}\partial_m\theta^{ni} + K^{jk}_{m}K^{im}_{l} - K^{ik}_{m}K^{jm}_{l} - (\partial_n\theta^{ij})(\Gamma^k_{pl}\theta^{pn} + K^{nk}_{l}). \tag{B.30}$$

The first line (B.28) is resulted in the celebrated Riemann curvature tensor:

$$(\text{B.28}) = \theta^{im}\theta^{nj}(\partial_m\Gamma^k_{ln} - \partial_n\Gamma^k_{lm} + \Gamma^p_{ln}\Gamma^k_{pm} - \Gamma^p_{lm}\Gamma^k_{pn}) = \theta^{im}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn}, \tag{B.31}$$

where in our notation it is defined by

$$\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn} = \partial_m\Gamma^k_{ln} - \partial_n\Gamma^k_{lm} + \Gamma^p_{ln}\Gamma^k_{pm} - \Gamma^p_{lm}\Gamma^k_{pn}, \tag{B.32}$$

as usual. The second line (B.29) is rewritten in terms of covariant derivatives as

$$(\text{B.29}) = \theta^{nj}\nabla_n K^{ik}_{l} - \theta^{nj}\Gamma^i_{nm}K^{mk}_{l} - \theta^{ni}\nabla_n K^{jk}_{l} + \theta^{ni}\Gamma^j_{nm}K^{mk}_{l}. \tag{B.33}$$

Hence, so far the contravariant curvature is summarized as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}^{kij}_{l} &= \theta^{im}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn} + \theta^{nj}\nabla_n K^{ik}_{l} - \theta^{ni}\nabla_n K^{jk}_{l} + K^{jk}_{m}K^{im}_{l} - K^{ik}_{m}K^{jm}_{l} \\ &\quad + \theta^{im}\Gamma^k_{nl}\partial_m\theta^{nj} - \theta^{jm}\Gamma^k_{nl}\partial_m\theta^{ni} - (\partial_n\theta^{ij})(\Gamma^k_{pl}\theta^{pn} + K^{nk}_{l}) - \theta^{nj}\Gamma^i_{nm}K^{mk}_{l} + \theta^{ni}\Gamma^j_{nm}K^{mk}_{l}.\end{aligned} \tag{B.34}$$

The second line in this expression still has terms involving the partial derivatives and the Christoffel symbols, but it turns out to be reduced to a covariant tensor

$$(\text{second line of (B.34)}) = -(\partial_n\theta^{ij} + \Gamma^i_{mn}\theta^{mj} - \Gamma^j_{mn}\theta^{mi})K^{nk}_{l} = -(\nabla_n\theta^{ij})K^{nk}_{l}. \tag{B.35}$$

Here we used (2.41), which is equivalent to the Poisson condition. Finally, we obtain the result

$$\bar{R}^{kij}_{l} = \theta^{im}\theta^{nj}\mathsf{R}^k_{lmn} - (\nabla_n\theta^{ij})K^{nk}_{l} + \theta^{nj}\nabla_n K^{ik}_{l} - \theta^{ni}\nabla_n K^{jk}_{l} + K^{jk}_{m}K^{im}_{l} - K^{ik}_{m}K^{jm}_{l}. \tag{B.36}$$

Proofs of (3.7) and (3.8) In this paragraph, we denote $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ and $u = X + \xi$, $v = Y + \eta$, $w = Z + \zeta \in \Gamma(TM \oplus T^*M)$. To show the desired relations, we preliminarily list the formulae following by definitions and from some manipulations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(f\xi)} g &= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g, && \text{(B.37)}\\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(f\xi)} \zeta &= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \zeta - (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta f)\xi, && \text{(B.38)}\\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(f\xi)} X &= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi X + (\bar{\iota}_\xi X) d_\theta f, && \text{(B.39)}\\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (fg) &= (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f) g + f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g, && \text{(B.40)}\\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (f\zeta) &= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \zeta + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)\zeta, && \text{(B.41)}\\
\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (fX) &= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi X + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f) X, && \text{(B.42)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used $d_\theta(fX) = d_\theta f \wedge X + f d_\theta X$. With these preliminaries, first, (3.7) is shown by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[X + \xi, f(Y + \eta)] = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi [f(Y + \eta)] - \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(f\eta)} X + \frac{1}{2} d_\theta (\bar{\iota}_{(f\eta)} X - \bar{\iota}_\xi (fY))\\
&= f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (Y + \eta) + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)(Y + \eta) - f \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta X - (\bar{\iota}_\eta X) d_\theta f + \frac{1}{2} f d_\theta (\bar{\iota}_\eta X - \bar{\iota}_\xi Y) + \frac{1}{2} (d_\theta f)(\bar{\iota}_\eta X - \bar{\iota}_\xi Y)\\
&= f[X + \xi, Y + \eta] + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f)(Y + \eta) - (d_\theta f)\langle X + \xi, Y + \eta \rangle. \qquad \text{(B.43)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Second, the equation (3.8) is shown by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\langle [u, v] + d_\theta \langle u, v \rangle, w \rangle + \langle v, [u, w] + d_\theta \langle u, w \rangle \rangle\\
&= \langle \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi v - \bar{\iota}_\eta d_\theta X - d_\theta \bar{\iota}_\eta X + d_\theta \bar{\iota}_\eta X, w \rangle + \langle v, [u, w] + d_\theta \langle u, w \rangle \rangle\\
&= \langle \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (Y + \eta) - \bar{\iota}_\eta d_\theta X, w \rangle + \langle v, [u, w] + d_\theta \langle u, w \rangle \rangle\\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\iota}_\zeta \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi Y + \bar{\iota} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \eta - \bar{\iota}_\zeta \bar{\iota}_\eta d_\theta X) + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\iota}_\eta \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi Z + \bar{\iota}_Y \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \zeta - \bar{\iota}_\eta \bar{\iota}_\zeta d_\theta X) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (\bar{\iota}_\zeta Y + \bar{\iota}_Z \eta) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \langle v, w \rangle,
\end{aligned}
\qquad \text{(B.44)}
$$

where we used $\bar{\iota}_\zeta \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi Y + i_Y \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \zeta = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi (\bar{\iota}_\zeta Y)$.

Proofs of (3.17) and (3.18) We denote $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, $\xi^- = \xi - G(\xi) \in \Gamma(C_-)$, $u = X + \zeta \in \Gamma(C_+)$. By definition and (3.7), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{D}_{(f\xi)} u &= \pi_+([f\xi^-, u]_R)\\
&= \pi_+(f[\xi^-, u]_R - (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\zeta f)\xi^- + d_\theta f \langle \xi^-, u \rangle) = \pi_+(f[\xi^-, u]) = f \bar{D}_\xi u, \qquad \text{(B.45)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used $\pi_+(\xi^-) = 0$ and $\langle \xi^-, u \rangle = 0$. Similarly, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{D}_\xi (fu) &= \pi_+([\xi^-, fu]_R)\\
&= \pi_+(f[\xi^-, u]_R + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f) u - d_\theta f \langle \xi^-, u \rangle)\\
&= \pi_+(f[\xi^-, u]_R) + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f) u = f \bar{D}_\xi u + (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi f) u, \qquad \text{(B.46)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\pi_+(u) = u$ is used.

Proof of (3.19) By using (3.8) for $u = \xi^-$ (note the footnote after (3.8)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \langle u, v\rangle &= \langle [\xi^-, u] + d_\theta \langle \xi^-, u\rangle, v\rangle + \langle u, [\xi^-, v] + d_\theta\langle \xi^-, v\rangle\rangle \\ &= \langle [\xi^-, u], v\rangle + \langle u, [\xi^-, v]\rangle \\ &= \langle \pi_+[\xi^-, u], v\rangle + \langle u, \pi_+[\xi^-, v]\rangle = \langle \bar{D}_\xi u, v\rangle + \langle u, \bar{D}_\xi v\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{B.47}$$

Proof of (3.23) First, by combining the results (B.37), (B.38) and (B.41), we find

$$\begin{aligned}[f\xi, g\eta] &= [f\xi, g\eta]_\theta \\ &= f\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(g\eta) - (\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{(g\eta)} f)\xi \\ &= fg\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi \eta + f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\eta - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\xi = fg[\xi, \eta] + f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\eta - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{B.48}$$

Second, from (3.17) and (3.18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{D}_{f\xi}\bar{D}_{g\eta}(hu) &= f\bar{D}_\xi(gh\bar{D}_\eta u + (g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)u) \\ &= f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(gh)\bar{D}_\eta u + gh\bar{D}_\xi\bar{D}_\eta u + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)u + (g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)\bar{D}_\xi u), \end{aligned} \tag{B.49}$$

with $u = \zeta^+$. Hence, on one hand, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&(\bar{D}_{f\xi}\bar{D}_{g\eta} - \bar{D}_{g\eta}\bar{D}_{f\xi})(hu) \\ &= f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(gh)\bar{D}_\eta u + gh\bar{D}_\xi\bar{D}_\eta u + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)u + (g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)\bar{D}_\xi u) \\ &\quad - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta(fh)\bar{D}_\xi u + fh\bar{D}_\eta\bar{D}_\xi u + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta(f\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi h)u + (f\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi h)\bar{D}_\eta u) \\ &= fgh(\bar{D}_\xi\bar{D}_\eta - \bar{D}_\eta\bar{D}_\xi)u + fh(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\bar{D}_\eta u - gh(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\bar{D}_\xi u + f\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi(g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta h)u - g\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta(f\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi h)u, \end{aligned} \tag{B.50}$$

and on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{D}_{[f\xi, g\eta]} hu = \bar{D}_{fg[\xi,\eta] + f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\eta - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\xi} hu \\ &= (fg\bar{D}_{[\xi,\eta]} + f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\bar{D}_\eta - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\bar{D}_\xi)hu \\ &= fgh\bar{D}_{[\xi,\eta]}u + fh(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)\bar{D}_\eta u - gh(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)\bar{D}_\xi u + f(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi g)(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)u - g(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\eta f)(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\xi h)u + fg(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{[\xi,\eta]}h)u. \end{aligned} \tag{B.51}$$

This shows

$$(\bar{D}_{f\xi}\bar{D}_{g\eta} - \bar{D}_{g\eta}\bar{D}_{f\xi} - \bar{D}_{[f\xi, g\eta]})(hu) = fgh(\bar{D}_\xi\bar{D}_\eta - \bar{D}_\eta\bar{D}_\xi - \bar{D}_{[\xi,\eta]})u. \tag{B.52}$$

Proof of (3.26) The bracket in (3.26) is computed by (3.3) as follows:

$$[dx^i - G^{ik}\partial_k, dx^j + G^{jl}\partial_l] = [dx^i, dx^j]_\theta + i_{dx^i} d_\theta(G^{jl}\partial_l) + i_{dx^j} d_\theta(G^{jl}\partial_l) + d_\theta G^{ij}. \tag{B.53}$$

Each term results in

$$\begin{aligned}
[dx^i, dx^j]_\theta &= \partial_k \theta^{ij} dx^k, && \text{(B.54)}\\
i_{dx^i} d_\theta (G^{jl}\partial_l) &= i_{dx^i}[\frac{1}{2}\theta^{mn}\partial_m \wedge \partial_n, G^{jl}\partial_l]_S \\
&= i_{dx^i}\left([\frac{1}{2}\theta^{mn}\partial_m, G^{jl}\partial_l]_S \wedge \partial_n - [\partial_n, G^{jl}\partial_l]_S \wedge \frac{1}{2}\theta^{mn}\partial_m \right) \\
&= \theta^{mn}(\partial_m G^{ji})\partial_n - \theta^{mi}(\partial_m G^{jl})\partial_l - G^{jl}(\partial_l \theta^{in})\partial_n, && \text{(B.55)}\\
i_{dx^j} d_\theta (G^{il}\partial_l) &= \theta^{mn}(\partial_m G^{ij})\partial_n - \theta^{mj}(\partial_m G^{il})\partial_l - G^{il}(\partial_l \theta^{jn})\partial_n, && \text{(B.56)}\\
d_\theta G^{ij} &= -\theta(dG^{ij}) = -\theta^{kl}(\partial_k G^{ij})\partial_l. && \text{(B.57)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the bracket reads

$$\begin{aligned}
&[dx^i - G^{ik}\partial_k, dx^j + G^{jl}\partial_l] \\
&= \partial_k \theta^{ij} dx^k + [\theta^{mn}(\partial_m G^{ji}) - \theta^{mi}(\partial_m G^{jn}) - \theta^{mj}(\partial_m G^{in}) - G^{jl}(\partial_l \theta^{in}) - G^{il}(\partial_l \theta^{jn})]\partial_n. \qquad \text{(B.58)}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (3.36)

$$\begin{aligned}
4(\bar{\Omega}_l^{kij} - \bar{R}_l^{kij}) &= 2\theta^{im}\partial_m(R^{jkn}G_{nl}) - 2\theta^{jm}\partial_m(R^{ikn}G_{nl}) - 2\partial_n\theta^{ij}R^{nkm}G_{ml} \\
&+ 2\bar{\Gamma}^{jk}_m R^{imn}G_{nl} + 2R^{jkn}G_{nm}\bar{\Gamma}^{im}_l + R^{jkn}G_{nm}R^{imn'}G_{n'l} \\
&- 2\bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_m R^{jmn}G_{nl} - 2R^{ikn}G_{nm}\bar{\Gamma}^{jm}_l - R^{ikn}G_{nm}R^{jmn'}G_{n'l} \\
&= 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i}R^{jkn})G_{nl} - 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^j}R^{ikn})G_{nl} - 2\partial_n\theta^{ij}R^{nkm}G_{ml} \\
&+ 2\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_m R^{mkn}G_{nl} - 2\bar{\Gamma}^{ji}_m R^{mkn}G_{nl} + R^{jkn}G_{nm}R^{imn'}G_{n'l} - R^{ikn}G_{nm}R^{jmn'}G_{n'l} \\
&= 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i}R^{jkn})G_{nl} - 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^j}R^{ikn})G_{nl} - 2\partial_n\theta^{ij}R^{nkm}G_{ml} \\
&+ 2\partial_m\theta^{ij}R^{mkn}G_{nl} + R^{jkn}G_{nm}R^{imn'}G_{n'l} - R^{ikn}G_{nm}R^{jmn'}G_{n'l} \\
&= 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^i}R^{jkn})G_{nl} - 2(\bar{\nabla}_{dx^j}R^{ikn})G_{nl} + R^{jkn}G_{nm}R^{imn'}G_{n'l} - R^{ikn}G_{nm}R^{jmn'}G_{n'l}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\theta^{im}\partial_m(R^{jkn}G_{nl}) = \bar{\nabla}_{dx^i}(R^{jkn}G_{nl}) + \bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_m R^{mkn}G_{nl} + \bar{\Gamma}^{ik}_m R^{jmn}G_{nl} - \bar{\Gamma}^{im}_l R^{jkn}G_{nm}, \qquad \text{(B.59)}$$

and $\bar{\Gamma}^{ij}_m - \bar{\Gamma}^{ji}_m = \partial_m\theta^{ij}$.

References

[1] T. Asakawa, H. Muraki, S. Sasa, and S. Watamura, "Poisson-generalized geometry and R-flux," *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A30** (2015) **17**, 1550097, `arXiv:1408.2649 [hep-th]`.

[2] T. Asakawa, H. Muraki and S. Watamura, "Topological T-duality via Lie algebroids and Q-flux in Poisson-generalized geometry," `arXiv:1503.05720 [hep-th]`.

[3] N. Hitchin, "Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds," *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **54** (2003) 281, `math/0209099`.

[4] M. Gualtieri, "Generalized complex geometry," `math/0401221`.

[5] M. Gualtieri, "Generalized complex geometry," `math/0703298`.

[6] J.-L. Koszul, "Crochet de Schouten-Nijenhuis et cohomologie," *Astérisque* (1985) 257-271.

[7] K. H. Bhaskara and K. Viswanath, "Calculus on Poisson manifolds," *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **20** (1988) 68-72.

[8] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach and F. Magri, "Poisson-Nijenhuis structures," *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.* **53** (1990) 35-81.

[9] R. Blumenhagen, A. Deser, E. Plauschinn, and F. Rennecke, "Non-geometric strings, symplectic gravity and differential geometry of Lie algebroids," *JHEP* **1302** (2013) 122, `arXiv:1211.0030 [hep-th]`.

[10] D. Andriot and A. Betz, "β-supergravity: a ten-dimensional theory with non-geometric fluxes, and its geometric framework," *JHEP* **1312** (2013) 083, `arXiv:1306.4381 [hep-th]`.

[11] A. Dabholkar and C. Hull, "Generalised T-duality and non-geometric backgrounds," *JHEP* **0605** (2006) 009, `arXiv:hep-th/0512005 [hep-th]`.

[12] J. Shelton, W. Taylor, and B. Wecht, "Nongeometric flux compactifications," *JHEP* **0510** (2005) 085, `arXiv:hep-th/0508133 [hep-th]`.

[13] C. Hull, "A Geometry for non-geometric string backgrounds," *JHEP* **0510** (2005) 065, `arXiv:hep-th/0406102 [hep-th]`.

[14] D. Baraglia, "Generalized geometry." Master's thesis, The University of Adelaide, 2007.

[15] N. Hitchin, "Lectures on generalized geometry," `arXiv:1008.0973 [math.DG]`.

[16] M. Gualtieri, "Branes on Poisson varieties," `arXiv:math/0710.2719`.

[17] R. L. Fernandes, "Connections in Poisson geometry. I. Holonomy and invariants," *J. Differential Geom.* **54** 2 (2000) 303-365, `arXiv:math/0001129v2`.

[18] E. Hawkins, "Noncommutative rigidity," *Comm. Math. Phys.* **246** 2 (2004) 211-235, `arXiv:math/0211203`.

[19] M. Boucetta, "Compatabilité des structures pseudo-riemanniennes et des structures de Poisson," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **333** Serie I (2001) 763-768.

[20] M. Boucetta, "Poisson manifolds with compatible pseudo-metric and pseudo-Riemannian Lie algebras," *Differential Geom. Appl.* **20** 3 (2004) 279-291, `arXiv:math/0206102`.

[21] M. Boucetta, "Riemann-Poisson manifolds and Kähler-Riemann foliations," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **336** 5 (2003) 423-428, `arXiv:math/0211035`.

[22] A. J. Bruce, "Killing sections and sigma models with Lie algebroid targets," `arXiv:1506.07738 [math.DG]`.

[23] A. C. da Silva and A. Weinstein, *Geometric Models for Noncommutative Algebras.* American Mathematical Society, 1999.

[24] S. M. Carroll, “Lecture notes on general relativity,” `arXiv:gr-qc/9712019`.

[25] Z.-J. Liu, A. Weinstein and P. Xu “Manin Triples for Lie Bialgebroids,” *J. Diff. geom.* **45** (1997) 647-574, `arXiv:dg-ga/9508013`.

[26] D. Roytenberg, “Courant algebroids, derived brackets and even symplectic supermanifolds,” Ph. D. thesis, Berkeley, 1999.

[27] P. Severa and A. Weinstein, “Poisson geometry with a 3 form background,” *Prog.Theor.Phys.Suppl.* **144** (2001) 145–154, `arXiv:math/0107133 [math-sg]`.

[28] D. Roytenberg, “A Note on quasi Lie bialgebroids and twisted Poisson manifolds,” *Lett.Math.Phys.* **61** (2002) 123–137, `arXiv:math/0112152 [math-qa]`.

[29] A. Weinstein, “The modular automorphism group of a Poisson manifold,” *J. Geom. Phys.* **23** (1997) 379-394.

[30] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach, “Poisson Manifolds, Lie Algebroids, Modular Classes: a Survey,” *SIGMA* **4** (2008) 005, `arXiv:0710.3098`.

[31] T. Asakawa, S. Sasa, and S. Watamura, “D-branes in Generalized Geometry and Dirac-Born-Infeld Action,” *JHEP* **1210** (2012) 064, `arXiv:1206.6964 [hep-th]`.

[32] T. Asakawa, H. Muraki, and S. Watamura, “D-brane on Poisson manifold and Generalized Geometry,” *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A29** (2014) 1450089, `arXiv:1402.0942 [hep-th]`.

[33] T. Kikuchi, T. Okada and Y. Sakatani, “Rotating string in doubled geometry with generalized isometries,” Phys. Rev. D86 (2012) 046001, arXiv:1205.5549.

[34] T. Okada and Y. Sakatani, “Defect branes as Alice strings,” JHEP 03 (2015) 131, arXiv:1411.1043.

[35] Y. Sakatani, “Exotic branes and non-geometric fluxes,” *JHEP* **03** (2015) 135, `arXiv:1412.8769 [hep-th]`.

[36] J. de Boer and M. Shigemori, “Exotic branes in string theory,” Phys. Rept. 532 (2013) 65, arXiv:1209.6056.

[37] T. Kimura and S. Sasaki, “Gauged Linear Sigma Model for Exotic Five-brane,” NPB 876 (2013) 493, arXiv:1304.4061.

[38] T. Kimura, S. Sasaki and M. Yata, “World-volume Effective Actions of Exotic Five-branes,” JHEP1407 (2014) 127, arXiv:1404.5442.

[39] T. Kimura, S. Sasaki and M. Yata, “Hyper-Khler with Torsion, T-duality, and Defect (p,q) Five-branes,” JHEP1503 (2015) 076, arXiv:1411.3457.

[40] T. Kimura, “Defect (p,q) Five-branes” *Nucl. Phys.* **B893** (2015) 1-20, `arXiv:1410.8403 [hep-th]`.

[41] A. Chatzistavrakidis, F. F. Gautason, G. Moutsopoulos and M. Zagermann “Effective actions of non-geometric fivebranes,” Phys. Rev. D89 (2014) 066004, arXiv:1309.2653.

[42] M. Park, M. Shigemori, “Condimension-2 Solutions in Five-Dimensional Supergravity” `arXiv:1505.05169 [hep-th]`.

[43] D. Andriot, A. Betz, "NS-branes, source corrected Bianchi identities, and more on backgrounds with non-geometric fluxes," *JHEP* **07** (2014) 059, `arXiv:1402.5972 [hep-th]`.

[44] A. S. Cattaneo and G. Felder, "A Path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula," *Commun.Math.Phys.* **212** (2000) 591–611, `arXiv:math/9902090 [math]`.

[45] M. Kontsevich, "Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds. 1.," *Lett.Math.Phys.* **66** (2003) 157–216, `arXiv:q-alg/9709040 [q-alg]`.

[46] P. Aschieri, C. Blohmann, M. Dimitrijevic, F. Meyer, P. Schupp and J. Wess, "A Gravity theory on noncommutative spaces," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 3511, `arXiv:hep-th/0504183`.

[47] H. S. Yang, "Emergent Gravity from Noncommutative Spacetime," *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **24** (2009) 4473, `arXiv:hep-th/0611174`.

[48] H. Steinacker, "Emergent Gravity from Noncommutative Gauge Theory," *JHEP* **0712** (2007) 049, `arXiv:0708.2426 [hep-th]`.

[49] H. Steinacker, "Emergent Geometry and Gravity from Matrix Models: an Introduction," *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27** (2010) 133001, `arXiv:1003.4134 [hep-th]`.

[50] D. Andriot, M. Larfors, D. Lust, and P. Patalong, "A ten-dimensional action for non-geometric fluxes," *JHEP* **1109** (2011) 134, `arXiv:1106.4015 [hep-th]`.

[51] D. Andriot, O. Hohm, M. Larfors, D. Lust, and P. Patalong, "A geometric action for non-geometric fluxes," *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **108** (2012) 261602, `arXiv:1202.3060 [hep-th]`.

[52] D. Andriot, O. Hohm, M. Larfors, D. Lust, and P. Patalong, "Non-Geometric Fluxes in Supergravity and Double Field Theory," *Fortsch.Phys.* **60** (2012) 1150–1186, `arXiv:1204.1979 [hep-th]`.

[53] D. Andriot, M. Larfors, D. Lust, and P. Patalong, "(Non-)commutative closed string on T-dual toroidal backgrounds," *JHEP* **1306** (2013) 021, `arXiv:1211.6437 [hep-th]`.

[54] D. Andriot, "Non-geometric fluxes versus (non)-geometry," `arXiv:1303.0251 [hep-th]`.

[55] D. Andriot and A. Betz, "Supersymmetry with non-geometric fluxes, or a β-twist in Generalized Geometry and Dirac operator," *JHEP* **1504** (2015) 006, `arXiv:1411.6640 [hep-th]`.

[56] C. Hull and R. Reid-Edwards, "Non-geometric backgrounds, doubled geometry and generalised T-duality," *JHEP* **0909** (2009) 014, `arXiv:0902.4032 [hep-th]`.

[57] C. Hull and B. Zwiebach, "The Gauge algebra of double field theory and Courant brackets," *JHEP* **0909** (2009) 090, `arXiv:0908.1792 [hep-th]`.

[58] B. Zwiebach, "Double Field Theory, T-Duality, and Courant Brackets," *Lect.Notes Phys.* **851** (2012) 265–291, `arXiv:1109.1782 [hep-th]`.

[59] G. Aldazabal, D. Marques, and C. Nunez, "Double Field Theory: A Pedagogical Review," *Class.Quant.Grav.* **30** (2013) 163001, `arXiv:1305.1907 [hep-th]`.

[60] O. Hohm, D. Lüst, and B. Zwiebach, "The Spacetime of Double Field Theory: Review, Remarks, and Outlook," *Fortsch.Phys.* **61** (2013) 926–966, `arXiv:1309.2977 [hep-th]`.